This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER:

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION,

DEVOTED TO

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY;

CONDUCTED BY

Alexander Campbell.

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation, and tribe, and tongue, and people; saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come: and worship Him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water. JOHN.

Great is the truth, and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

NEW SERIES—VOL. III.

BETHANY, VA.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY A. CAMPBELL.

1839.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.
1897.

PREFACE.

A PREFACE to a miscellaneous periodical is, for the most part, a matter of form, rather than of propriety or utility. The painting of a human hand upon a Museum, or a synagogue on the building which contains a panorama view of Jerusalem and the surrounding country, is quite as good a guide and omen to all that is within, as any preface we could write at home, or here upon the Atlantic ocean, to the third volume of the new series.

By the way, a travelling Editor, a non-resident Bishop, and a Baptist pluralist, have no signs nor prefaces for their labors in all the symbolics of natural and artificial language. They are a species of non-descripta, oddities, and incongruities, which seem not to have arisen in all the visions of the authors of language and of stipulated signs. A Baptist Elder, with a plurality of churches, to whom he breaks the bread of life, and for whom he has to give an account, may, indeed, amongst the polygamists of the olden time, find some resemblances; but as this is rather a disgraceful alliance now-a-days, few of them would like to have, for their armorial, a man standing by the hymeneal altar with two brides on his right hand, and two on his left.

I cannot, then, either from the nature of the case, or from the localities of my personal itineracy, write a preface to the following volume. I know not what it may be; but I know that I intend it shall be no worse, but rather better, than any that preceded it. We aim at fewer controversies, and these of shorter pieces; and a greater variety of matter, and still more practical tendencies. The great subject of Education—state education, church education, family education, self-education—demand, and shall have more of our attention.

The bringing of the churches more practically under the Christian discipline and training—to delight more in the primitive worship—to be more punctual and constant in assembling themselves on the Lord's day—and to make their meetings more interesting to themselves and to the whole community, are objects of primary and accumulating importance. An influx of new converts greater than a corresponding preparation for their growth in grace and perfection of Christian character, is a positive *disadvantage* both to them and to the cause.

If the recruiting officers of any army enlist more troops than can be well fed, well clothed, and well disciplined by the regular officers and quarter-masters of the army, their accession weakens rather than strengthens the nation, and endangers rather than secures its existence and prosperity. There is a great deficiency, not in the system we advocate, but in the practice of many congregations in this very essential concern. All true-hearted men, and real friends of our immortal King, will gladly co-operate in such a grand undertaking as bringing the Christian communities up to the standard of their professions. To bring a thousand churches, large and small, up to the present standing of a few that I could name, would do more for the promotion of the cause of truth, and the triumph of our principles of reformation and the conversion of multitudes, than the immersion of one hundred thousand converts in one year, without such a system!

Christian righteousness and Christian piety deserve to have, and they must have, still more attention. This age is exceedingly *licentious*. Liberty, with us, is fast passing into licentiousness. The morals of American professors are rather portentous. In the counting-room, in the market-place, in the forum, in the tavern, in the steam-boat, on the farm, (I had almost said in the church,) a man's profession of Christian faith will not often secure him from suspicions of things dishonorable, unjust, or ungenerous, in the esteem of men of the world. What a sad charge compared with the times, when, to say, "I am a Christian," was a passport to the confidence of even the enemies of Christianity, for all that was true, just, and generous among men. In such a state of things, a Christian is doubly bound to be an honor to that profession, in all goodness, righteousness, and truth, which would, in more auspicious times, have been, and which should, in every age, be, a sacred ornament and shield to all under its pure and sacred banners.

I have in a few instances seen, or thought I saw, persons called Reformers, who seemed to think that it was a part of their Christian privilege to be freed from the restraints, and from the strict exactness of certain customs and usages, so conspicuous in some of the more rigid sects in the land. If these restraints and customs are either religious or moral—if they belong to the individual and private Christian, or to the Christian household, it is a great and a fatal mistake. A Christian by profession is, and must necessarily be, strict, minute, and circumspect, even to "the mint, the anise, and the dill" of Christian duty. To neglect even the tithing or consecrating to the Lord the smallest portions of our capacities and opportunities for doing good, would have been censured by the Lord, on the principle of his rebukes to the ancient Pharisees; who, while they did these, omitted the

greater matters of the law. These little things, said he, "you ought to have done." The present volume must descend, if descending it can be, to press these matters.

But that I may not seem to imitate one, who wrote a book under the title of *De Omnibus et Singulis, et quibusdam aliis;* which, in our language, means, *Concerning all things in general, and every thing in particular, and certain other matters;*—and as the swell of the ocean makes it difficult to write, I shall only add one word from myself—that, with a single eye this volume shall supremely look to the intelligence, purity, and happiness of all its readers, on all the subjects on which it may be called to treat.

A. CAMPBELL

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER,

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME III.——NUMBER I.

BETHANY, VA. *JANUARY*, 1839.

INCIDENTS ON A TOUR TO THE SOUTH.

NO. I.

ALTHOUGH the same necessity for evangelical itineracy does not now exist which prompted the travels of the ancient Prophets and Apostles, still it is both necessary and expedient. The periodical press, in the form of tracts, magazines, and newspapers, constantly peregrinates the whole land, in all its length and breadth, and scatters intelligence, good and evil, from the centre to the circumference of the whole community. But yet there are millions that either cannot, or will not read; and if they did, they are slow to understand, and still slower to feel and appreciate the truth that is written. Besides, there is a warmth—a power in the living voice, that cannot be imparted to the written letter; and, therefore, the tongue is more puissant than the pen.—Hence it is, that, although we make the grand tour of the United States once every month on the pages of the *Harbinger*, we feel it expedient occasionally to take an excursion, personally into some sections of this wide dominion, for the double purpose of acquiring and communicating, face to face, information on the great subjects of religion and morals.

In obedience to many calls from the South, we have been induced to undertake a long journey into those regions, and to spend a few months in scattering the seeds and principles of that reformation of faith and manners—of systems and of men—of sinners and of saints, to which we have consecrated our lives and labors. Such an object is the only one that could justify the husband of such a wife—the father of such a family—and the guardian of such a charge as that which Heaven in its benignity has vouchsafed to the Editor of the Millennial Harbin

ger, in tearing himself off for so long a time from all the tender ties and sympathies—from all the pleasures and responsibilities —from all the delightful cares and social endearments of the domestic circle—this best and richest of earthly bounties which the Father of mercies has bestowed on mortal man. True, indeed, our self-denial in this case bears but a faint resemblance, rather than any real proportion, to the sacrifices which the best of men, in former times, were called to make in the best of causes—in establishing and extending the knowledge of salvation by a remission of sins through the tender mercies of our God. The ancient heralds of Christ's gospel were often compelled to forsake wife and children, houses and lands, and to jeopardize all earthly good for the sake of obeying their Master, and saving themselves and their contemporaries from the impending ruin which soon or late awaits all who live in sin. Still we are thankful for even a taste of that sweet-bitter cup of self-denial, which, at least, enables us to form a conception of those mingled emotions of joy and sorrow, of pleasure and pain, of which they so liberally partook; by whose toils and labors—by whose privations and sufferings, the gospel has reached us in these remote ends of the earth.

On the 8th of October, accompanied by my daughter Lavinia and brother Joseph Henley, late from Georgetown College, Ky. we left Bethany, and on the morning of the fourth day found ourselves, via Baltimore, safely lodged in the proud capital of the United States, distant from Bethany almost three hundred miles.

Every thing but religion has improved in Washington since we last visited the Metropolitan City. The President's house, the navy yard, and the capitol, are all rising in worldly pomp and splendor. Indeed, every thing appears less and less Christian and Republicun. The capitol is, indeed, truly magnificent, and the public grounds around it exhibit exquisite taste; still, however, progressing towards a higher perfection in the cultivation of shrubbery and flowers. It is impossible for an American citizen to perambulate these beautiful grounds, survey this gorgeous edifice, and enter its spacious and splendid rooms, rich and luxuriant in all the varieties of ancient architecture, and not feel a corresponding pride kindle within him. The sculpture and paintings are truly Roman and Pagan, and conspire to prove what little influence the gospel of peace yet exerts over the American people. If, indeed, ours be a *representative* government—if our legislators represent the people—and if the capitol and its appurtenances represent the wisdom, taste, and morality of the representatives, then does the spirit of Pagan Rome yet reign in the body of the nation. Would you believe me, Chris-

tian reader, that MARS, the Roman god of War, and JANUS, the Roman god of Peace, stand in *Roman marble*, larger than life, in the rotunda—at the very entrance of the temple of American liberty! True, indeed, our national device, the American Eagle, more august than the Roman, and perched in sublime altitude, looks down upon all other birds of prey as greatly beneath his daring, and preaches to the universe that we have more of the spirit of war and of spoil, than of the peaceful Dove in our Constitution. But if Protestant and royal England, out of all savage beasts, elects the RAMPANT LION as the symbol of her spirit and her relative glory, we Americans, the sons of such belligerent sires, may justify ourselves in picturing out our national spirit under the eye, the beak, and the talons of our native Eagle! But, indeed, this is only one of a thousand proofs that republican America is, no less than the monarchies of the Old World, a part of the magnificent image which arose on the plains of Dura, to the astonished vision of the proud despot of ancient Babylon; and, unless she repent of her sins, must feel the triumphant power of that STONE which smote the image into the dust of the summer threshing floor.

I have never spoken the word of the Lord in Washington. Among other reasons, one is—that I know of nothing more antipodal to the gospel than politics. The *meum* and the *tuum* of the American statesman are the truest antagonistic powers in society against the philanthropy of Christ's gospel. This is the true reason why the United States' capitol specially, and the State capitols generally, are the most dry and barren grounds in all the country. True, indeed, there have been a few statesmen who have been devoted to religion, and some to Christianity:—even Julius Cesar was the Pontifex Maximus of the Roman Empire; Wilberforce and Soame Jenyns, of the English Parliament, are favorably known to the Christian community; there was one Senator in the Sanhedrim that consented not to the deed of the sixty-nine who condemned Jesus; there was one Joseph in the Court of Pharoah, and one Daniel in that of Nebuchadnezzer: and who knows but there may be one or two Christians in the American Congress! Still it is about as hard for a Christian man to please unchristian constituents, as it is for any one to serve God and Mammon. The true politician rises by descending to cater for the lusts and passions of men. Besides, the breath of the Forum is as the Simoom of the desert to the life of the soul. The time has not yet come when the saints shall judge, or legislate for the world. Still, I would not say that the gospel ought not to be preached even in the District of Columbia. But in my case, and at the present time, I was not permitted to make an effort, though I was besought by one or two Israelites, in whom I found no guile.

In passing from Washington to Fredericksburg I had the pleasure to find brother Carman, of Baltimore, on board the steam-boat; and Mr. Mede, the Diocesan Prelate of Virginia. The former was on his way to the meeting at Fredericksburg, and the latter was returning from the exercise of his episcopal functions in some part of his immense diocess. The Bishop and I happened, by some singular caprice of nature, to be seated together in the same stage, from the landing on the Potomac to the city of Fredericksburg; but as it was in the night, we conversed *incognito* on several important points—such as the tendency of things political and ecclesiastic to monarchy in this, as in other countries;—the origin of the tithe system;—the necessity of reform among the English Bishops;—the signs of the times in that country;—the evils attendant on State religions and popular establishments, &c. &c.—the details of which it would be as improper as it would be tedious to relate. Upon the whole, I was much pleased with the liberality, candor, and good nature of Bishop Mede.

We met our appointments in Fredericksburg, where we delivered some five discourses. We spoke once at Antioch; once at Mr. Boulware's, Newton, King and Queen; once at Elder Henley's, on the Rappahannock; twice at Tappahannock church; once at Smyrna; once at Mangohick; six times in Richmond; four times in Charlottesville; twice in Scottsville; twice at Sandy River church, Prince Edward county; twice at Springfield, Lunenburg county; and at Painesville, near which Dr. Thomas lives, we discussed with him, before his personal friends and brethren, the merits of his new theories, during three days, which was equal to about seven or eight discourses of one hour each. We spoke once in the theatre in Petersburg, making in all some thirty seven discourses, in about thirty-four days.

At most of these points, and indeed at all, when the weather permitted, we had large and attentive audiences. Many pleasing, and some painful incidents occurred, of which the narrative would be more tedious than interesting. We had the pleasure of meeting many of our old friends and brethren, and partaking of the hospitalities of very many excellent spirits in the Old Virginia style. Brother Coleman, from Albemarle, met us at Fredericksburg, and continued with us the whole time in Virginia, much to our gratification and comfort. We found our brethren Bagby, of Louisa, and Henshall, of Richmond, waiting for our arrival at our old friend Wolfolk's, of Caroline. The former was with us at several points, and the latter continued in our company till we arrived at Richmond. We met our much esteemed brethren Henley, Du Val, and Pendleton, with many others, at Antioch; and so continued to meet at every point other

brethren of note among the disciples, till we arrived at brother Carter's, in the environs of Richmond. Brother Ferguson, of whom the brethren give a good report in all places, attended not only our meetings in Fredericksburg, but also at Tappahannock. These brethren, as well as some others, as far as I could observe and learn, are exerting a salutary influence in behalf of reformation.

We had formed a resolution before we arrived at Fredericksburg, not to pay any attention to the speculations which for some time had been sedulously taught and propagated by a few friends of *universal* discussion. I held fast my resolution till I got down to Tappahannock; but finding that some two or three individuals, in almost every church, still kept the matter alive; and thus, besides disturbing the peace of the congregations, neutralized the proclamation of the word to those without, I found myself compelled to speak first in private, and then, on one or two occasions, in public, on these roots of bitterness and discord.

This is one of the excrescences, or fungous protuberances, which sometimes grow on the tree of free discussion. Many know not where to stop when their minds are set loose from their ancient moorings: they cut the cable and drift away upon the shoreless ocean of absolute speculation: they think their rights are invaded if you suggest the unlawfulness, or even the inexpediency of razing the foundations of the whole system of received opinions at one single effort, and of abandoning all tenets and principles which they cannot mathematically, philosophically, or by direct testimony support and prove. This is the real mania of all reformations, both in politics and religion. It has been fully carried out in the French Revolution, and in the Neologisms of the New Theology in Germany. Hence no sort of evidence, but that of *sense*, could prove the existence of a disembodied spirit, an angel, or a devil, to some spirits that have been seized with this Sadducean philosophy. And to say that it is an unlawful or an untaught question, is regarded almost as turning Pope and proscribing free discussion. In such a state of things I was compelled to the conclusion that we must meet the opinions on the principles of their own free discussion, and either prove them to be *untrue*, or at least *unprofitable* and useless questions. One example of this sort we feared might be a dangerous precedent; but not to do it, we saw was likely to be more dangerous; and, therefore, after due deliberation, we resolved to visit (especially as we had received some pressing calls) the vicinities where these matters were more effectually taught and more generally entertained. We did so, and it is with much pleasure that we anticipate the order of events in our narrative to inform our readers, that, after three days canvassing those opinions with

their author, and before his most select friends and the public, it was proposed by the brethren to close the discussion and hold a meeting to bring about an issue of the whole matter. They did so. A resolution was *unanimously* adopted by all the brethren, and very cheerfully acceded to by brother Thomas, (a copy of which may be found in this number,) that those speculations should no more be propagated in word or writing by their author; and on certain explanations and concessions a reconciliation between myself and brother Thomas was effected, which, I trust, is never to be interrupted by any such matters.

We met all our appointments but three—one at Smyrna, one at Bethesda, and one at Farmville, Prince Edward county. The two first were prevented by rain, and the latter by indisposition. There was north and east of Richmond but one point, Smyrna, where we spoke, at which there was no existing controversy or discussion of those abstractions. Seven persons were there immersed, amongst whom was S. S. Henley, a worthy graduate of William and Mary, who immediately joined our company, and agreed to make the whole tour with us to the South.

At Newton, King and Queen county, we had a very pleasing interview with our old friend Andrew Broaddus. He attended our meeting, and favored us with a friendly conversation on various incidental matters. He enjoys good health; but, like most men on the environs of 70, is evidently descending the hill of life. It would be a consummation devoutly to be wished, could he, before he passes the Jordan of time, induce his brethren to rescind their "*Orders in Council*," and to open their ears to a candid consideration of the points at issue between them and us. It would do them no harm to move forward a few paces towards the primitive simplicity of the gospel, and to the practice of the ancient institutions of Christ. They would not have to give up any truth in admitting all that we contend for, as many of them now concede. We only ask for a renunciation of human traditions; and wherever they are found they ought to be abandoned. The word of the Lord shall stand for ever; but the counsels of men shall come to nothing.

The Baptists in Virginia are certainly less like their own denomination now than they were one hundred years ago, if there be any truth in their history. They have adopted the recruiting and converting tactics of the Methodists even to a superfluity of excitation. Their new converts are born in a tempest of passion and feeling, under the inflammatory process of long protracted meetings, and of deeply impassioned appeals to their fears and feelings. They live only in the high temperature of excitement, and languish under the dispensation of reason and truth. This is too generally the fact, as many incidents and vouchers attest.

Elder Kerr, formerly of Richmond, was a master spirit in this refined animalism, or moving of the blood and passions. He was one of God's *called* ministers, and for many years a choice spirit in the work of excitement. But a desire to go to Congress seized the revivalist, and he gave back his call to Heaven, resigned his license to preach to the church on earth, and was found on the political arena, scuffling for the meed of political fame, rather than for the crown of life, which he had so long held out to his hearers as supremely worthy of their ambition. But having failed in gaining the lofty eminence of his aspirations, he asked for his "call" from Heaven and his license from the church, and is again on the Lord's side from a necessity laid upon him to preach the gospel;—not, however, exactly like that necessity of which Paul spoke when relating his obligations to announce the word. Man, indeed, in his best estate, is altogether vanity. The Baptists have, unfortunately, filled their ranks with too many such spirits; and hence the difficulty of getting along by the force of truth without the impulse of feeling. They cannot keep up the excitement, and therefore not many of these converts live.

Let no one hence infer that we are opposed to feeling. God forbid! A religion without feeling is a body without a spirit. A religion that does not reach the heart and rouse all our feelings into admiration, gratitude, love, and praise, is a mere phantom. But we make feelings the *effect*, not the *cause* of faith and of true religion. We begin not with the feelings, but with the understanding: we call upon men first to believe, then to feel, and then to act. The gospel takes the whole man—the head, the heart, the hand; and he only is a genuine Christian who believes, feels, and obeys from the heart the whole mould of doctrine delivered to us by the holy Apostles. A. C.

FALSE TESTS OF TRUTH AND ERROR—*No. I.*

Well balanced and well educated minds are generally not more numerous than the peers of the realm, or the privileged orders of any community. We would not, however, be understood as intimating that the aristocracy of wealth, or of rank, embraces the intellectual or moral nobility of any country. They have, only in proportion to their numbers, the chance of inheriting any portion of it. Still, as intellect and morality govern the universe, in all civilized society well balanced and well educated minds must exercise a formative influence over human character, and, to a considerable extent, mould the fortunes of such as fall under their jurisdiction.

Men of great *parts* are not always great *men*. Indeed, I would rather say that men of great parts are generally but *parts* of great men. Men of this class are sometimes the greatest misfortunes to society. Such men were Voltaire, Volney, Rousseau, Paine. And were it admissible, in this sectarian age, to speak of party leaders, either in philosophy or religion, with the same freedom, it would be easy to adduce a crowd of examples. But this invidious task we decline; and only say, that men of extraordinary parts must always be men of very ordinary parts: for, as the organs, or parts by which the mind operates, occupy a given space, the *extras* must all be taken out of the *ordinaries*. Many of the English bards, from Biron back to Savage, most happily illustrate this nice point. Their great parts left no room for the other parts which are essential to a perfect mind. Hence, what are called the eccentricities (rather the follies) of some who have the reputation of men of genius. Indeed, so common is the observation that persons distinguished for any extraordinary attribute have something odd or wanting, called "eccentricity," that those who *would* be distinguished, whether Nature has distinguished them or not, first set about acquiring the eccentricity of a man of genius. This is, alas! too easily obtained; and hence so many acquire the folly, without securing the wisdom of great men.

According to the true science of the human mind, it consists of a given number of powers or attributes. These all must be fully developed according to their value or functions in forming a perfect mind in its intellectual and moral nature: for, according to the old school, an extraordinary memory has often associated with it a very ordinary judgment; and an extraordinary judgment, a very ordinary memory: and so of other powers.* And, according to the most erudite phrenologists, those heads are the best that are freest from extraordinary *bumps:* for as there cannot be lofty mountains without deep vallies, or great elevations without corresponding depressions; so there cannot be large protuberances on the human skull without adjoining indentations. But enough of this, as we all agree that a truly great man is not a man of a few great parts; but a person all whose parts are on a large scale, and no one of them either developed or educated at the expense of another.

"*Smart* men" have been the nimblest errorists in the world. They are too smart to think long or deeply on any subject. They regard study as prosing dulness, and as an infallible evidence of the want of brighter and piercing intelligence. They bring forth first, and travail

* The most extraordinary memory that I ever saw was the property of an idiot!

afterwards. Indeed, were it not for their exuberant leniency to their own errors, which fortunately always happens to be in the direct ratio of their censoriousness towards those of others, their lives would be one protracted scene of repentance. But, fortunately for their present peace, while they file on wires of brass the peccadilloes of others, they bind up their own faults and blunders with the gossamer of the morning.

Persons of this class are the worst guides of the public mind that can be selected. They are so in every department of thought; but most of all so in religious matters. Like the moon, they give but little light, less heat, and are subject to many changes. A few preachers of different religious denominations have fallen under my notice, who are perfect models of this character; but I will not name them here. They reason a good deal; for they are "*smart* men:" but—they reason most fallaciously. I have found some instances in our own community that more demand our attention. But as I should not name those more than those; and as I would correct, if possible, the same faults in all, I have concluded, without any personal allusions whatever, to write a number of essays on *False Tests of Truth and Error*, and on fallacious modes of attacking error, and of defending truth. These essays must be short; and, therefore, but one topic for one essay. For the present we select

THE POPULARITY OF A TENET.

With some the popularity of a tenet, either in philosophy or in religion, is a test of its truth; with others, it is a proof of its error. They are both wrong—decidedly, essentially, and radically wrong. He that makes the popularity of a tenet a proof that it is true, and he that would make it a proof that it is false, are equally deceptions and fallacious reasoners.

In the first place, all *new* things are unpopular. Things that are new and strange are, of course, received but by few; or, in other words, truths the most popular now, were once as unpopular as the grossest errors could now be. The popularity of a tenet is, then, a pure accident. So is its unpopularity.

But, in the second place, the attributes of truth are all essential attributes; for truth is immutable and eternal. The progress or prosperity of a tenet is always, or may be purely accidental. But that which is a pure accident of any subject is no part of its nature, as it may be with or without it. Therefore, the popularity or unpopularity of any tenet never can prove it true or false.

There is, however, to many minds, a more obvious process of proof. I allude to the history of tenets. Every received truth, in science or religion, has its own true history. So have all the errors in the world.

That history teaches,—(and what is history but philosophy teaching by example!)—I say, history on all her pages declares, that the present most popular truths and errors, either in science or religion, were once unpopular; and that the popularity of any particular tenet is, in all cases, the work of time; and, for the most part, of causes extrinsic to itself.

To keep within our own favorite subject, religion, we would observe that the most popular truth in all Christendom—nay, among Jews, Turks, and Christians, is one that was in the time of Abraham the most unpopular in the world. Need I say that this truth is, *There is but one God!* It has been growing in popularity for almost four thousand years. Among Christian truths, *that Jesus is the Christ* promised in the Old Testament, is now most popular. It was at first believed by but one person, and for several years by but a few individuals. The same may be said of his death *for our sins*—of his resurrection for our justification—and of all the great tenets of the whole New Testament. Now either we must admit that popularity can convert truth into error, or error into truth; or admit this great truth, that *the popularity or unpopularity of any tenet is a mere accident*, and never can be adduced in argument *for* or *against* it, as a proof of its truth or error.

Error is like truth in this respect; for it, too, at first, is unpopular. That Mahomet is a true Prophet was once unpopular in all the East. Now it is believed by a hundred millions and more. All the errors of Popery—the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, transubstantiation, worshipping of images, and prayers to and for the dead, &c. &c. were once most unpopular. The polytheism of the Pagan world was introduced by one person: now it is the most popular belief on earth.

I have regretted to hear some of our brethren speak of their principles as if they ought to be admitted, if not wholly, at least in part, because of their unpopularity. Our opponents were recommending their tenets because of their popularity. This, I presume, drove them into the opposite extreme, as extremes beget extremes, and they balanced the account by *doubting* the truth of all popular tenets; and were on the precincts of offering unpopularity as a test of some of their principles.

The Mormons say, "Many are called, but few are chosen;" "Strait is the gate of life, and few there be that enter it," &c. &c. These and a hundred other texts they urge as proof that their tenets and their Bible are divine! Indeed, though I would not run into another extreme, I strongly incline to the opinion, that, in regard to tenets long propagated, especially if they have passed through a fiery ordeal, if they are not popular they are not true. But this needs to be well guarded; and, therefore, I would not say that if they are popular they

must needs be true. That all the items of the Christian faith—such as the advent of the Messiah at the time appointed—his miracles, doctrine, life, death, burial, resurrection, ascension—the resurrection of the dead, future judgment, &c. &c.—the one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one body, one spirit, one hope, one God and Father of all, &c., &c. are universally admitted through all the length and breadth of Christendom; and, therefore, the most popular truths in it I rejoice to know. But unfortunately there is one thing very unpopular—not the assenting to the tenets of the Apostles, but the living according to them—not the admiration of virtue, but the practice of it.

If I suspected that any one would interpret the word *popular* by the standard of any recent sect—such as the tenets of Episcopalianism, Methodism, Presbyterianism, Quakerism, &c. &c. or what identifies and distinguishes these, I would protest against such a limitation of the word. That the *shibboleths* of a party should be popular as the party, is saying nothing worthy of regard. All tenets are popular among all those who embrace them, though there be not a thousand persons.

But, perhaps, more is already said than the occasion demands, and more than enough to satisfy the most zealous or jealous of popularity or unpopularity—that neither the one nor the other can rationally or logically be regarded as a test of either the truth or error of any science or religion. A. C.

Wilmington, N. C. Nov. 21, 1838.

MORALITY OF CHRISTIANS—*No. XII.*

Never was oracle more true than that which saith, "They that *will be rich* fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in perdition and destruction; for *the love of money is the root of all evil;* which, while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith and pierced themselves through with many sorrows." Travellers in India tell us, that as they approach the temple of that modern Moloch—the idol Juggernaut—the road, for many miles distant, on either side, is strewed with the spoils of death. The bones of the pilgrims, bleaching on the plains, spread all around, indicate the multitudes that have immolated themselves at the shrine of this insatiate monster. As evident it is to those who wear the spectacles of Revelation, and look through the glasses of Law and Gospel upon society, that equal multitudes in this country immolate

themselves, though not in the same manner, yet as fatally and as certainly, at the altars of that still more ancient, insatiate, and cruel monster—Mammon. His temples are in every city, village, and hamlet—in all latitudes and in all climates; and, however men may differ in theories, in philosophy, and religion, these minor differences never mar their communion and fellowship around the altars of this golden idol. Here the Pharisee and the Sadducee, the Calvinist and the Arminian, the High Churchman and the Low Churchman, the Orthodox and the Heterodox, fervently, with one heart and soul, unite in presenting their sincere devotions. In this worship the sincere are many, and the hypocrites are few.

There are, indeed, a few half-souled worshippers, who at first design only a partial homage; but most of these at last become whole-hearted in the service. This class are sensible enough to see through the deceitfulness of all the promises of this idol, and have no intention of being immersed into his faith and service; but, by tampering with his temptations, their passions are seized, their understandings are led captive; and, ere they are aware, they are irrecoverably gone into his delusions. Many who once stood fair in the Christian profession, are now not merely members, but officers in the temples of Mammon, and have assumed the whole livery and costume of this idolatry. Their course has been first an immersion into debt; then, to meet their covenanted vows and promises, immense struggles became necessary. These sometimes fail: then their promises totter and fall; and with them sicken and die all that delicacy of feeling, that honorable sensibility and conscientiousness which are the sovereign guarantee and defence against all meanness, falsehood, and injustice. No one becomes obdurate at once. There is a process to this state of mind as to every other: but, by a repetition of acts of duplicity, prevarication, and deception, the habit is formed; and, by degrees, a person is carried forward to a course of action and to feelings from which, at one time, he would have turned away with horror, and said, like one of old, "Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this thing!"

Truly, then, may it be said, that "*the love* of money is the root of all evil." It is not money itself, but the *love* of it, that stimulates to all those misdeeds that drown men in destruction and perdition. Under the goadings of this passion, men contract unreasonable and unlawful debts, sacrifice peace of mind, jeopardize in many instances the resources of their families, and rush into adventures so bold and daring, if not absolutely romantic, that, to succeed, or to escape bankruptcy and ruin, they must use means and make efforts which Christianity unconditionally repudiates and disallows. They must think, devise, and

plan, by day and night, until they have neither taste nor time for Bible reading or Bible praying. The ordinances of Christianity become to such persons insipid forms: they take no interest in them, because they can derive no comfort from them. They cannot read God's Book with pleasure, for it condemns them. They cannot pray to God in faith, because they know that they pray not with their whole heart. In one word, religious observances are, to them, clouds without rain, trees without fruit, breasts without milk, and bottles without wine. They are so nigh dead and withered branches, that they might as well be broken from the vine and thrown over the fence.

Such instances are not so very rare—alas! they are numerous amongst the mass of the professors of the present day. If men had learned to obey that apostolic precept, "*Owe no man any thing but love*," what souls might have been saved that are now gone to destruction! I do not say that men—that Christians, are neither to borrow nor lend. We are commanded to *lend:* therefore it cannot be a sin to borrow. Still we may borrow and lend without violating the precept of the Apostle. But he that borrows what he cannot pay when it is due; and still more, he that borrows what he has not good reason to think he can pay at the time promised, must be a defaulter so far as Paul commands in the precept before us. An attention to this apostolic injunction would do more to bless this community, than all the laws which the present Congress or the next is likely to enact during the whole term of their legislative service. A. C.

Augusta, Geo., November 27th, 1838.

For the Millennial Harbinger.

A PERFECT MAN IN CHRIST JESUS—*No. IV.*

In my third number I closed upon the great importance of the use of the tongue, and our conversation, to make us "perfect in Christ Jesus." We generally form our judgment of the minds of men by their conversation. This is agreeable to the teaching of Jesus Christ: "Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." When a man dwells with pleasure upon any topic, we judge correctly to say, Such is the calling of that man. Is he a farmer? Though a stranger, you will soon find him out. Is he a merchant, a mechanic, a seaman, a soldier, a politician, a wicked or righteous man? His conversation is an index to his mind, or calling. Is he a Christian? Then his conversation, as well as his conduct, will prove it: for out of the abundance of his heart his mouth (if opened) will speak: "for where *his treasure* is, there will be his heart also." To see or hear a professor of Christianity dwelling, with pleasure, upon the trifling, vain, empty things

of this world, proves he is "carnally-minded," which "is death." So says Paul.

But I must return to my subject;—Paul exhorts Timothy, who was an *Evangelist*, "Let no man despise thy youth; but be thou an example of the believers, *in word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity*." To the Hebrews he says, "Let *your conversation* be without covetousness, and be content with such things as you have:" for he hath said, I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee. James asks, "Who is a wise man, endued with knowledge among you? Let him show out of a *good conversation* his works with meekness of wisdom." Paul says, "Our rejoicing is this—the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity and godly sincerity—not with fleshly wisdom, but by the grace of God, we have had *our conversation* in the world, and more abundantly to you-ward." Peter exhorts his brethren—"As he who hath called you is holy, be ye *holy in all manner of conversation; having your conversation honest* among the Gentiles; that whereas they speak evil against you as evil doers, they may, by your works, which they shall behold, glorify God in the day of visitation." Again—"Having a good conversation, that, whereas they speak evil of you, as evil doers, they may be ashamed, that falsely accuse *your good conversation in Christ*." The conversation of a man of God will prove a savor of life unto life, or a savor of death unto death. "Whoso offereth praise, glorifieth me; and to him that *ordereth his conversation aright, will I show the salvation of God*." So said David. Malachi informs us of the conversation of the proud, and of those that feared the Lord:—"*Your words* have been stout against me, saith the Lord; yet ye say, What have we spoken so much against thee? Ye have said it is vain to serve God, and what profit is it that we have kept his ordinances, and that we have walked mournfully before the Lord of hosts? And now we call the proud happy; yea, they that work wickedness are set up; yea, they that tempt God are delivered. *Then they that feared the Lord spoke often to one another;* and the Lord hearkened and heard it; and a book of remembrance was written before him for them that feared the Lord, and that *thought upon his name*. And they shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels; and I will spare them as a man spareth his own son that serveth him. Then shall ye return, and discern between the righteous and the wicked; between him that serveth God, and him that serveth him not." Such will be the happy lot of "every man perfect in Christ Jesus" Thus perfect love will cast fear out of the "man perfect in Christ Jesus." Amen!

THOMAS M. HENLEY.

CHRISTIAN UNION.

The following extracts were taken from the *Union Herald*, of August 31st, 1838:—

Christian Union Convention,

Held at Syracuse, N. Y., August 21st, 1838.

"It is the first General Convention for the purpose of promoting this Heaven-originated enterprize, that was ever held in this State; and the

only one, we believe, of the kind, which has been enjoyed in the United States, if we except the Convention which was held on the Western Reserve, during the summer of 1837."

The following Report was submitted to the Convention by the Business Committee: viz.—

"1. *Resolved*, That they, who are fit to enter the church in heaven, are fit members of the purest church on earth.

2. *Resolved*, That faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, is the key that opens the door of the church of heaven, the Lord of heaven having himself said, 'He that believeth shall be saved.'

3. *Resolved, therefore*, That to require more of the candidate for admission into the visible church, than satisfactory evidence that *'he believeth on the Lord Jesus Christ,'* is virtually to reject *him* whom the Saviour receives, and to exalt the claims of the church on earth above those of the church in heaven.

4. Whereas the visible church is instituted by divine authority, and its ordinances and privileges intended for all the disciples of the Lord Jesus:—*Resolved, therefore*, That, knowingly to shut out from the benefit and enjoyment of those ordinances and privileges any one of these disciples, however humble, or ignorant, or erring he may be, is to incur the fearful guilt both of invading the rights of regenerated man, and of resisting God.

5. *Resolved*, That when we are admonished of the pernicious consequences of receiving into the visible church Christians who widely disagree with each other on important religious subjects, we reply, that we feel no more responsibility for such consequences than we do for the consequences of obeying any other requirement of the Saviour."

An Address was also presented and ordered to be read, out of which we make the following extracts:—

"*Beloved brethren*—No person, acquainted with the words and the heart of Jesus Christ, believes that it is his choice to have his disciples separated from each other by party lines—wearing the badges, and contending with each other about the peculiarities, of their respective sects. He, whose prayer for his disciples was, 'that they all may be one,' would have his church as seamless as was his garment. Nor will any person familiar with the sacred volume, believe that the Apostles preferred the division of Christians into various parties, to their collection in the same fold and under the same banners. If Paul loved parties in the church, he would not say 'that there should be no schism in the body;'—he would not enjoin 'one faith,' 'one spirit,' 'one mind,' 'one accord,' 'the same mind,' 'the same love.'

However it may have been formerly, it is certain that, in our age, the church is not characterized by that unity which Apostles labored to impress upon her, and for which her Redeemer so ardently prayed. Nor is it less certain that the present division of his disciples not only finds no justification in the Bible, but that it is utterly forbidden, both by its spirit and letter. Does it not then, dear brethren, greatly concern us to know why this division is maintained? Two causes, accounting for it, present themselves to our minds. In the first place, there are amongst the professed disciples of the Saviour, not a few, whose big-

otry, intolerance, and contentiousness are gratified by this division: and, in the second place, there are others of these disciples who are justifying and prolonging this division through their mistaken belief that union will at last come out of it. Believing that Christians who do not hold similar views on all important points in theology, cannot be brought into a harmonious and profitable association with each other, they judge it better, that, whilst this disagreement continues, these Christians should remain in their respective sects. Hence, in a great measure, the maintenance of these numberless sects," &c.

The Address was accepted, and the Resolutions, after some considerable discussion, were unanimously adopted; the second being put in the following terms:—

"*Resolved*, That faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, is, on his own authority, the condition of salvation."

Said Committee lastly presented a Declaration of Sentiments, prepared by the Rev. S. Hawley, Cazenovia, N. Y.; out of which we present the following extracts:—

"I. EVILS OF SECTARIANISM.

We solemnly believe that *sectarianism*, wherever it exists, or under whatever circumstances found, is a sin of the first magnitude: it is a daring encroachment upon the Divine prerogatives,—a bold assumption of unauthorized and irresponsible power,—a determined war on the divinely constituted arrangements of the church of Christ,—an open and perpetual infraction of the sacred rights of conscience,—a ruthless sundering of the ties of spiritual consanguinity,—and is utterly and forever repugnant to the genius of the gospel, and every feature of the Christian system. Its set up new and antagonist interests in the kingdom of God, which are made paramount to the common interests of Christianity,—assumes the legislative function in the church,—imposes new and unauthorized tests of church membership,—supersedes the divine constitution of the church by a code of laws of its own enactment,—breaks up the household of faith into endlessly warring factions—disturbs the peace, destroys the symmetry, mars the beauty, wastes the energies, and endangers the existence of the body of Christ, by making it the seat of angry strife and perennial wars,—robs the followers of Christ of the distinguishing badge of discipleship,—grieves the spirit,—betrays the cause to the enemy,—promotes every species of error,—arms infidelity with its most deadly weapon with which to assail Christianity,—abets most effectually the Papal usurpation,—endangers our natural and Christian rights,—defeats most directly the ends of scriptural discipline,—opens the doors of the church to hypocrites,—creates and maintains a worthless, unevangelical, and time-serving ministry,—appropriates the substance of the church to the maintenance, strengthening, and perpetuity of its own interests,—stays the conquests of the Cross,—renders the gospel powerless,—hinders the conversion of sinners,—destroys the force of Christian testimony,—prevents the cultivation of heathen fields of labor, by monopolizing the services of ministers,—opposes the object of the prayer of our Lord,—puts an embargo on the intellect,—prohibits the

increase of scriptural knowledge,—obstructs the march of moral improvement,—impedes all moral enterprizes,—checks a growth in grace, —calls forth and strengthens the baser passions of fallen humanity,—genders pride, aversion, and jealousy,—scatters the seeds of these appalling evils on Pagan lands,—robs heaven of its rightful inhabitants, —and people perdition with countless beings for whom Christ died. These we regard as some of the deadly and direful fruits of this pernicious tree. Such a tree, producing such fruits, should not, most certainly, be permitted to occupy a place in the garden of the Lord.

II. DUTY OF IMMEDIATE UNION.

Nothing can be more clear, we think than the duty of the saints, dispersed throughout these contending factions, under such circumstances. These evils, which threaten to sweep away every vestige of apostolic order and gospel arrangement, with the mighty interests that are bound up with the destiny of the church, must be speedily met and thoroughly remedied. And this can only be done by Christians 'putting away the evil of their doings; ceasing to do evil, and learning to do well.' The treasonable course of the church must no longer be pursued; her usurped power must be surrendered; her unauthorized arrangements must be relinquished; her new and conflicting interests must be abandoned; her legislative enactments must be pronounced illegal and void; her disjointed and scattered fragments must be collected and formed into a body of perfect symmetry, unsullied beauty, and undivided strength; and she must submit to the order, arrangement, and control of her adorable Head in all things. This is an immediate, urgent, and indispensable duty; a duty which she owes to her Divine Head and to the world.

This union the holy Saviour devoutly implored might exist among his disciples; *this* he solemnly, repeatedly, and authoritatively enjoined upon them; *this* he constituted the badge of their discipleship—the certificate of their adoption, legible to all; this he made necessary to their growth in grace and perfection in knowledge; and *this* was essential to the world's believing that he was sent of the Father.

No truth has so much prominence in the Bible, as the *unity* of the saints. No point do the Apostles so often and so strongly urge; no duty so solemnly and so frequently enforce, as the *perfect oneness* of believers. And they placed their union on high and sacred ground. The *oneness* of their spiritual origin; the *oneness* of their relation; the *oneness* of their hope; the *oneness* of the body of which they are the members; the *oneness* of the Spirit which animates it; the *oneness* of the Head that adorns and controls it; the oneness of their faith, and of their baptism, constituted emphatic reasons in the eyes of the Apostles for their *perfect unity*. Eph. iv. 3, 4, 5

On this high ground they enforced the duty of union. For these very obvious reasons they required believers to 'labor *intensely* to preserve the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.' For these reasons those who caused divisions among them were to be marked and avoided as the worst enemies of the church. And for these reasons they were to speak the same thing, and be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment. Who, in view of these solemn facts, can doubt that it is the immediate and indispensable duty of Christians to cease their unhallowed contentions, furl their party ban-

ners, discard their denominational distinctions, and reunite on that basis and in that form which the gospel requires? If they all have the same high spiritual origin,—all have the same hope of their calling,—all are members of the same body, that is animated by *one* Spirit and governed by *one* Head,—all have embraced the same faith, and received the same baptism; and if all have the same God who is above all, through all, and in them all; then they are *one* in the highest sense which can be conceived, and are bound to exhibit this sublime *oneness* to a gazing world. And, moreover, if this union was the burden of the intercessory prayer of the holy Saviour; if he solemnly and frequently enjoined it on his disciples; if he made it the badge of their discipleship and certificate of their adoption; if it was essential to their growth in grace and perfection in knowledge; and if it was necessary to convince the world of his divine mission; then, certainly, no considerations can possibly justify disunion in the 'household of faith.'

If, then, as all must admit, it is the duty of Christians to be *one*, it is a *present* duty. Nothing should be held valid that keeps them disunited a moment. No considerations of *supposed* expediency should tempt them to remain in their present divided state. They are bound by the most solemn obligations to discard and remove *immediately* whatever is found to hinder a reunion of the dismembered fragments of the church of Christ. Until this is done, and such a union effected as the gospel contemplates and imperiously enjoins, the church will be clothed in sackcloth; her 'tears' will be perpetually on her 'cheeks,' and the strings of her 'harps upon the willows,' will only be swept by 'the mournful breezes of the surrounding desolation.'

III. PLAN OF UNION.

What *'plan'* of union should be adopted? In what should this union consist? These are grave questions, and they demand serious and definite answers. Nothing can be more vastly important than clear, precise, and scriptural information on the points involved in these questions, at this stage of the sublime enterprize in which we have embarked. Obscurity and error here, will greatly embarrass our action and impede the progress of the cause. And we must not, in matters of such grave moment and involving such practical considerations, depend on the deductions of our own reason. We need plain, well defined, scriptural principles of action, to be conducted safely and directly to the desired issue. Without these we can form no just ideas of the work to be performed, the evils to be removed, or the difficulties to be adjusted. Without these embarrassment will attend us at every step, our efforts will be random and fruitless, and a signal and complete failure will be the inevitable result. Without such principles, to form a union, would be to create a combination most undesirable and dangerous. But having these principles and the light they will impart, the work to be done will be clearly perceived; the evils to be remedied will appear in their true aspect and dimensions; the proper remedy will be readily suggested; and the *union* formed will be of a desirable and permanent character.

The 'plan' of union, then, should not be one of human device. It must originate with the God of union, and bear unequivocal marks of his sanction. If we cannot find such a *plan* developed in the Scriptures of truth, our enterprize is without proper foundation, and should be

forthwith abandoned. But amid the turmoil and confusion that sectarianism has produced, the fundamental principle of Christian union in the kingdom of Christ has stood firm and unshaken; and it is too plain to be unobserved by the dullest comprehension. It stands out most prominently on the pages of inspired truth. How it has been so long overlooked is a matter of the deepest mystery. THE EXAMPLE OF CHRIST IS THE FUNDAMENTAL LAW OF HIS CHURCH IN MATTERS OF FELLOWSHIP, ORDER, AND DISCIPLINE. This the Bible most unequivocally teaches. With striking frequency the example of our Lord is referred to by the Apostles, as of supreme obligation in the church. They seemed to have regarded it as the only fundamental law of her Statute Book. Let us attend to a few scripture evidences on this point:—'Therefore, receive ye one another, *as Christ also received us*, to the glory of God.' Rom. xv. 7. 'Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not: and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth: *for God hath received him.*' Rom. xiv. 3. 'Be ye *imitators* of God, as dear children, and walk in love *as Christ also loved us.*' Eph. iv. 1, 2.

'For as much, then, as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, *what was I that I could withstand God.*' Acts xvi. 17. The duties here enjoined must be perfectly obvious. The principles so lucidly developed in these passages apply equally to Christians in their individual and associate capacity. They are the following:—1st. That we are to receive and fellowship others on the same principle, and for the same reason that Christ receives and fellowships them and us. 2d. That we are not in any case to condemn one whom God has received. 3d. That to deny the hand of Christian fellowship and church privileges to one to whom God has given his Spirit, is to make war upon God. 4th. That we are to exercise the same love towards believers that Christ did towards us. And hence, 5th. *That the example of our Lord, in all particulars, is the supreme law of the church.* This is clearly the sum total of all these commands. The example of Christ, then, is the sublime standard to which all our actions are to be strictly and scrupulously conformed. To carry out this principle is the great object of Christian life; and on this principle *only* can a desirable and permanent union among the saints be formed. This is the only firm and authorized basis for such a superstructure. Let this principle be adopted and carried out, and all schisms in the body would cease; and it would again assume its original symmetry, unity, and loveliness.

In the light of this principle, the proper course and duty of Christians in matters of fellowship and communion, whether in their individual or associate capacity, will be perfectly plain and intelligible. To decide their duty in reference to persons who claim Christian regard and fellowship, it is only necessary to ascertain the feelings and conduct of the Great Head of the church towards them. This is the only thing to be determined to make the path of duty perfectly obvious. Peter regarded it as a self-evident proposition, that to withhold fraternal fellowship and church privileges from one to whom God had given his Spirit, was to resist God. The gift of the Spirit to an individual was, to his mind, indubitable evidence that God had received him. And to refuse to receive one whom he had received, was to withstand God. All that he demanded was evidence that God had received a

person, to welcome him to the fellowship and immunities of the church. This was the great law of the primitive church; and it is as obligatory on all Christians *now* as it was then. It is as true *now* as it was then, that to refuse the fellowship and privileges of the church to one whom Christ has received, is to resist God. The duty is as solemn, as urgent, and as authoritative *now*, to admit to the rights, immunities, and fellowship of the church all those whom Christ receives, as it was then. The order of Christ's house has undergone no change. The fundamental law of the church still exists in all its force. The example of our living Head must still be regarded as of supreme authority among Christians.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

THE DIVINE ORDER FOR EVANGELIZING THE WORLD,

AND FOR TEACHING THE EVANGELIZED HOW TO CONDUCT THEMSELVES.

THE divine orders for evangelizing the world, and for teaching the disciples all things that they should observe to do, as recorded by Matthew and Mark, when taken together, may be correctly rendered as follows: see Matth. xxviii. 16, 18, 20. and Mark xvi. 15, 16. The eleven disciples went away into Galilee, to a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And he came and spake unto them, saying, "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, into all the world, preach the gospel to every creature, disciple all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even to the end of this state. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned."

From this portion of the divine testimony it evidently appears, 1st. That the apostolic commission is founded upon the official authority of Christ. 2d. That it embraces every human creature, without exception. 3d. That the subject matter of their preaching and teaching is *exclusively* intended for the salvation of the nations. 4th. The apostolic preaching was for a time entirely oral, being addressed only to the ear. Wherefore it was said that "faith comes by hearing." 5th. That when the Apostles had fulfilled their commission, had finished their work, by publishing the gospel and law of Christ to the nations, and had left it fully recorded in the possession of the churches, it necessarily follows, that, thenceforth, oral dictation ceased to be authoritative; and, that both the church and the world must, thenceforth, depend exclusively upon what was written, for their instruction and salvation; and, consequently, that preaching of

proclaiming did, in its just and primary import, then for ever cease; and teaching alone remain. It is true, the word might still be proclaimed to those that never heard it, by reading to them what had been already published, referring to the evidence, both external and internal, by which it had been, and still might be, confirmed: but this we properly call teaching, the things having been already proved and published, and so made public property: the subsequent teachers, in the mean time, not pretending to produce immediate supernatural evidence for what they taught, as the first proclaimers did: wherefore their mere oral dictation could have no divine authority. These things being evidently so, church edification must, as far as verbal teaching is concerned, have thenceforth been effected by reading the sacred record, with appropriate observations and exhortations. For this alone containing all that the disciples were to believe and do, in order to secure the continued enjoyment of the divine approbation; nothing farther could be necessary, but only to read it intelligibly, and enforce it with the proper arguments, divinely furnished for that purpose.

Now, in order to accomplish this in the most effectual manner, the true, literal, and constructive meaning of words and phrases, and also the grammatic and rational connexion of sentences and sentiments should be made so evident, that the reading may be clearly understood, and its meaning forcibly felt. And this would evidently require such profound attention, both on the part of the teacher and of the taught, that on neither part it could be done by rote. but that, on the contrary, it would require, on both sides, a previous and preparatory attention, in order to the aforesaid strict and intelligent perusal, that it might be duly understood and retained; without which all reading is mere formal trifling. Let the church then take up its Book, and read and study it thus, that so it may duly understand and retain it; and, in so doing, it will act in character; it will honor the Book of God; and, in so doing, it will both honor its Author, and edify itself; and thus enjoying the inestimable benefit, which it was divinely intended to convey to the intelligent, retentive, practical student. Thus will the church resume its proper character; that is, the school of Christ, disciples, Christians: and will not henceforth shame its Master, through its stupid, wilful, shameful ignorance of his only Book. No—For instead of its present lamentable neglect of this its primary and all-important duty, every member would be every day studiously memorizing a competent portion of it, for his daily edification and comfort—his meditation and conversation—the subject matter of his praise and prayer. These portions would also be rehearsed with interest every evening, in the family circles, for social edification,

with appropriate remarks, prayers and praises; and certain other portions read with pertinent questions and observations, as preparative for church edification on the Lord's day, having been previously appointed for that purpose.

On Lord's day morning, say at 10 o'clock, the church meets to spend four hours together, with a short interval of half an hour; the worship commences with the celebration of the resurrection by appropriate singing, prayer, reading and singing. Here it is worthy of remark, that not only each of the four Evangelists close their respective narratives with each an account of the resurrection; but the Apostle Paul also, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, 15th chapter, gives us a very interesting doctrinal view of the certainty and import of this glorious and all-important event: so that, if we choose to be directed by time, that great index to human affairs, we have a chapter for every first day in each month, even when there happens to be five, and each of these the peculiar record of a different witness. After an hour spent in this most blissful exercise, in which we celebrate the happy event of our own justification in our Surety's resurrection, "who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification," we may next proceed in the office of teaching, by reading correctly, with proper explanatory remarks, practical observations, and suitable exhortations, the portions of holy scripture previously appointed; the disciples, in the mean time, all strictly attending with open books; that so they may not only be edified by the observations and exhortations, but also be duly instructed to read the scriptures correctly and intelligently; and thus, in due time, become duly acquainted with the Divine Book, which never can be the case in the present mode of proceeding. This exercise being over, intermit after singing and prayer. After half an hour's interval, the disciples having come together again to commemorate the Lord's death; that all-important subject being introduced by singing, then, after reading with pertinent remarks some portion of the sacred record relative to this most solemn and interesting event; and commemorating it as divinely prescribed; having concluded this part of the worship with singing, the teachers might next profitably proceed to review the morning lecture, by asking such pertinent questions as the text duly and retentively understood, will fairly answer: then, after appointing with suitable remarks and exhortations, the lessons for the week, to be duly prepared for the next meeting, dismiss with singing and prayer; each, at parting, contributing something to the common stock for religious purposes, as God has prospered him. Thus would church edification cease to be done by proxy, and so become the common business of all concerned; every one, according to his

ability and opportunity, thus laboring to promote his own edification, and also to contribute to that of others. And thus church edification properly becoming a church business, the overseers and rulers would be justly exempt from the enormous task of studying for the whole congregation; having henceforth only to attend to their own appropriate duties of teaching and ruling, by directing the studies, correcting the mistakes, enforcing the duties, and so securing the proficiency of all concerned; withal correcting or rejecting the disobedient and unruly, thus preserving good order and decorum in the house of God. Thus would Christian edification become truly general and progressive, each doing and enjoying his part. And seeing that all enjoyment lies in employment, and that whatever a man sows, that shall he also reap, both in quantity and quality; it would, therefore, appear impossible to imagine, how Christian edification can otherwise be duly promoted and secured, than by thus availing ourselves of the due use of the holy scriptures, both publicly and privately. It would also appear that there is no other scriptural way of getting rid of, what we generally call *text-teaching*; that is, attempting to edify the church by saying what we please, and placing it all to the account of a detached sentence or two, previously read for that purpose There appears, indeed, but two just and consistent ways of using the holy scriptures to edification: the one is, the reading of them with respect to their proper contextual connexion; the other is, the taking of the amount of the divine testimony upon a particular topic, by collecting together into one view, the various passages that mention said topic: that by so doing, we may duly ascertain the import of the divine testimony concerning it; having the sum of the evidence fully before us. Now in either of these ways of using the holy scriptures for public edification, we have done with the aforesaid text-preaching; for, in both, we come directly and immediately to the text itself, to receive our instruction directly from it, contextually and grammatically understood. What remains, then, but that we so use the holy scriptures, for promoting and securing those all-important purposes?

But would not the adoption of this, or any other plan of procedure, look too much like a human formula or liturgy? We answer in the negative. For there is nothing here proposed, but what must be done by social agreement, if we act socially at all; namely, the time of day to meet and spend together, and how we shall proceed in the use of the means divinely appointed for our edification, so that all things, that we ought to do, be "done decently, and in order,"—"all things for the use of edifying," according to the divine canon: 1 Cor. xiv. 26. And, as to the subject matter of our religious exercises, we propose nothing but

what is divinely appointed; viz. The didactic use of the holy scriptures, and the observances therein appointed, for edification of the church.

There is, we are sorry to see and hear it, a superstitious scrupulosity to which men are liable—*pernicious extremes*—against which we should be continually upon our guard. *Hear* it. "Wherefore," say they, "because much evil has been done by church articles, creeds, and formulas; therefore, we'll have no church records of any sort." They might just as well say, 'Because there have been so many private and public frauds and impositions practised by printing and writing, therefore we'll have nothing more to do with either; we'll do all hereafter by memory and word of mouth.' What a preposterous conclusion would this be! The very reverse should be adopted; viz. That, whereas we have heretofore committed ourselves, and been imposed upon, by printing and writing, we will henceforth be very cautious what use we make of either.

No voluntary society can be united but in sentiment; nor cooperate for the purpose of its union, but in consequence of a certain agreement to act by certain rules; these, therefore, ought to be well and certainly known to all concerned. This being as plain as demonstration, therefore every church should, of course, have a fair and explicit record of its sentimental agreement, and rules of procedure for accomplishing the ends of its association; and this both for its own sake, and that of the public. That by this means the members might fairly understand each other, and so be duly prepared to act in concert; also, that, as a society, they might defend themselves against misrepresentation: and lastly, for the sake of such as might feel disposed to become members; that they might clearly understand the rules and sentiments that characterize and govern the society, with which they are about to unite. And who sees not the justice and propriety of such a course; yea, the indispensable necessity of it, not merely for the essential purposes just mentioned, but also for the still more special purpose of self preservation; that said society be not a mere ephemeral production, the offspring and tenant of a day, liable to some destructive change every hour, which cannot be prevented for want of a demonstrable, fixed, and constitutional unity? To prevent, then, this fatal catastrophe, let its formative, essential, and regulating principles be well and truly defined, that so they may be duly understood and defended; also, its rules of self government and co-operation so clearly and definitely stated, that none can ignorantly mistake his duty.

Thus will the society, if constitutionally right, be rendered intelligent, permanent, and prosperous. Wherefore, for those very important purposes, the following specimen of a Church

Record is respectfully submitted to the consideration of the churches of the proposed reformation:—

PLAN OF A CHURCH-BOOK, CONTAINING—VIZ.

1. A declaration of sentiment.
2. The names of the members at the date of the book.
3. A record of additions by baptism, by letter, or otherwise.
4. A record of deaths; also, of dismissals, specifying the time and causes.
5. An account of contributions and expenditures.

DECLARATION OF SENTIMENT.

We, the undernamed, disciples of the primitive apostolic gospel of Jesus Christ, meeting in ——, &c. ——, declare, 1st. That, considering the disunion, disaffection, and discord, so generally prevailing amongst the professors of Christianity, in direct opposition to the most express declarations of the divine will, and to the manifest subversion of the benign and blissful intentions of our holy religion, feel in duty bound by the divine authority, to have no fellowship with those destructive evils, by conscientiously abstaining from the evil causes which have produced them, and which still continue to keep them up; namely, teaching and practising the doctrines and commandments of men; and making their inferences and opinions articles of faith and terms of communion; against all which unauthorized and ruinous practices we enter our humble and earnest protest; taking the Divine Word alone as the only and all-sufficient rule and expression of our faith and obedience.

2d. That thus taking the Holy Scriptures alone, as the only perfect and all-sufficient expression of the divine will, it is our earnest desire, and sincere intention, to reduce them to practice; and so to make a rule *of* them, and be ruled *by* them; that we may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God—be made wise to salvation, thoroughly fitted for every good work.

3d. That we heartily approve and fellowship all, as the genuine and approved disciples of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who conscientiously and dutifully disapproving of the above evils, take the Holy Scriptures alone, as the only and adequate rule and expression of their faith and duty: and so make it their constant and diligent study, night and day, to understand, believe, and obey them.

THOMAS CAMPBELL.

Bethany, Va., December 12, 1838.

UNIVERSAL DISCUSSION.

MR. EDITOR,

Dear Sir—I WOULD be glad to discuss with you the great questions involved in the *supra*, and *sub-lapsarian* controversy. I think, sir, that much light upon the whole remedial scheme might be elicited by an investigation of the great inquiry whether that scheme was contrived *before* or *after* the fall of Adam. I take you to be a *supra-lapsarian;* and as I am decidedly a *sub-lapsarian*, we might have a spirited discussion of these grand points. I hope you will be forthcoming.

Very respectfully your friend,

GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS.

The Heights of Pisgah, 11th month and 12th day.

MR. EDITOR,

My dear Friend—OBSERVING that you are of the popular faith concerning the Divinity, and that you use the word *Spirit* pretty much as do the populars; and being myself a conscientious *anthropomorphist*, I have thought it might conduce to the gratification, and perhaps to the edification of your readers, if that matter were fully discussed in your pages; and as no other person has appeared on my side of the question, I feel willing to undertake to show that God himself, and all spirits have eyes, ears, lips, hands, feet, &c. as we have; and that the phrases concerning the rising, standing, walking, seeing, hearing, smelling, talking, &c. &c. are to be understood *literally*, and not figuratively: indeed, I am satisfied that no spirit can see without eyes, hear without ears, or walk without feet; in one word, sir, I am a firm believer in the good old doctrine of *anthropomorphism*. I trust that you will indulge myself and your curious readers with a full and impartial examination of this subject.

Very obediently and kindly, your friend,

BARON SWEDE.

Mount Nebo, 12th month, 3d day.

MR. HARBINGER,

I HAVE lately read Edwards on "Liberty and Necessity," on "Free Agency," and on "Physical and Moral Ability and Inability;" and seeing that you, as well as some other theological writers, assume this doctrine of physical and moral ability, and being persuaded that it is, root and branch, a sophism of speech—a mere literary delusion, I should like to enter the lists with you and show that there is no *power* but in the will. I feel myself able to prove that all human power, whether intellectual or corporeal, is in the will or determination of the mind; that the hand or foot cannot move; that the mind can neither perceive nor reflect, but as they are impelled by that something which we usually call *the will*. Therefore, to say that a sinner has physical power to do what God bids, but lacks moral power, is learned nonsense. What say you, Mr. Harbinger, to a discussion of this question?

Your friend,

NICANOR CURIOSO.

Princeton College, Supra, November, 1838.

My dear Friend—

It seems to me that you are unreasonably opposed to *destructionism;* and that you prefer, without proper authority, the vulgar notion of eternal suffering of pain, to the much more rational and scriptural speculation of absolute destructionism of wicked and ungodly men; and as I am sure that the absolute reduction of man to eternal unconsciousness would be more honorable to God, because more kind to sinners, than an eternal consciousness of pain, I am desirous to show your readers that the absolute annihilation of consciousness is the true destructionism of philosophy, and the uncorrupted Bible doctrine of the everlasting punishment of the wicked. Will you not, then, open your pages to this most interesting subject?

Your Friend,

WILLIAM PENN.

Vale of Hinnom, September, 1838.

Mr. Editor—

As free and full discussion is the order of the day, and as there are many questions yet undecided on all subjects; and most especially in that most engrossing of all subjects, religion, I would humbly propose to you, sir, the propriety of devoting a part of every number to some of those very interesting questions, yet undecided in the Christian world:—Such as, "Who was Melchisedeck?" "Which of the sons of Ham was the father of the Negroes?" "What was the mark set on Cain?" "What ultimately came of the pillar of salt into which Lot's wife was converted?" "Where was the *prison* in which those spirits were lodged who refused to repent under Noah's preaching?" And "What was that thorn in the flesh, that messenger of Satan, that gave the Apostle Paul so much trouble?" Now, my dear sir, as the full exposition and decision of these and other similar most interesting matters would greatly enlighten and reform the world, I hope you will gravely reflect upon the necessity and utility of giving them a full share of your attention.

Respectfully your friend,

SOLOMON VIRTUOSO.

The Springs of Helicon, October, 1838.

REPLY.

Gentlemen,

The subjects of which you respectively write to me, are, no doubt, of importance in your eyes. To a thousand other persons of your curious and speculative fancy, a thousand other subjects might appear equally interesting; and for the same reasons that I ought to attend to your queries, I would be compelled to attend to theirs; and thus the life of an antediluvian would be occupied in discussing questions, which, after we had done our best, every generation would have to settle for itself, as though we had said nothing about them. Now, gentlemen, as the decision of most, if not all of these questions, cannot make any one better or happier, I do not think that we are at liberty to

occupy our minds on such themes. True, indeed, one or two of these points may be so propounded as to nullify some sayings in the Bible, and in that case might call for some attention; but as they do not yet entrench upon our premises, I must decline the discussion of them, while we have on hands so many practical matters of greater moment.

It is not only the simple inutility of such discussions that vetoes our attention to them; nor is it even the positive evil that might accrue to the Christian community from the contagion of such a spirit of uncurbed licentiousness of discussion; but it is the actual loss of time, labor, and money, vainly expended in proving that which no matter how well proved, saves nor sanctifies no man; which, if expended judiciously on the great and glorious matters of the gospel of Christ—of the redemption of the world—of the intellectual and moral improvement of society, might yield a large revenue of glory to God and of happiness to man, in saving sinners and in edifying saints. This is, with us, the controlling reason. the sovereign consideration why we should not waste our lives in such South Sea dreams—why we should not cultivate barren sands on the sea border, while our fertile hills and rich alluvial vallies are undressed and unsown, and consequently unproductive in the good fruits of righteousness and life. What wise financier would invest his capital in the stock of broken companies, where he must ultimately lose, not only the interest, but the principal also! So is every one—preacher, talker, writer, or editor, who fills the ears and the hearts of those to whom he ministers with untaught and unprofitable questions—with abstruse, recondite, and inoperative speculations, rather than the good and wholesome doctrine which is according to godliness. He invests his labors in stocks that will never yield one cent of profit. He does worse than he who buried his talent in the earth: for in that case he might have saved the principal; but in this, both principal and interest are lost for ever.

Preachers who fill their sermons, and religious authors who fill their pages with matters speculative and scholastic, that cannot reach the heart, that cannot mould the temper nor reform the life, would be more usefully employed in some other business; and those who listen, and those who read, would save both time and money by employing themselves in either acquiring or communicating useful knowledge on any other subject, literary or scientific, rather than in acquiring, under the name of religious knowledge, that which is neither faith nor knowledge, literature, science, nor art.

Universal discussion is neither the right nor the privilege of the Christian. All things that may tend to genuine intelligence, purity, and happiness, are lawful and often expedient; but those that cannot,

are neither lawful nor expedient. In one word, whatever may enlarge our knowledge of the universe, of its natural and moral government—whatever may increase our knowledge of God or of man, and of our relations to the past, present, and future, is both desirable and useful, and constantly to be sought after; but whatever presents to us words for ideas, opinions for facts, shadows for substances, curious speculations for practical principles, men's reasonings instead of God's word, abstractions for realities, is to be contemned and repudiated by every intelligent and pious citizen of Christ's kingdom. For these reasons, gentlemen, and for many others which you may easily infer, I beg to be excused at the present time in declining to discuss your respective hobbies. One of those questions only seem to be of any practical value; and should that become more apparent, I may be induced to notice it hereafter. Meanwhile, I am glad to be excused from the labor of answering a thousand and one such puzzling questions; and hope that I shall be still as acceptable to you as if I had thoroughly refuted your favorite points.

Very benevolently your friend,

A. C.

Erwinton, S. C., December 3, 1838.

THE RELIGION OF EXCITEMENT, AND THE EXCITEMENT OF RELIGION.

In the present day we seem to have more of the religion of excitement than we have of the excitement of religion. The ancient and apostolic plan of first enlightening the understanding by declaring and illustrating the testimony of God, seems to be both too rational and slow for the ardent demands of the proselyting spirit of the age. Our Saviour and his Apostles spoke plain good sense to the understandings of men, knowing it to be God's chartered way to the heart. Paul teaching that "faith came by hearing"—that "hearing came by the word of God"—and that as he "preached so the people believed," was only anxious to declare the whole testimony of God, with its innate and cognate evidences of the divine authenticity. His preaching being first understood and then believed, he knew could not possibly fail to seize the heart with omnipotent power, and turn it to God, and Christ, and heaven. Therefore, he never made an effort to excite the feelings of any audience until he had "declared to them the whole counsel of God." He threw no artificial exciting circumstances around them: he never thought of "an anxious seat," nor of "a mourning bench," and

never called up convicted and trembling sinners to pray for them. These are all of the greenhouse or hotbed appliances of the present day. Our mushroom Christians sometimes grow to perfection in a night, and wither in a day. They have no root in themselves. They are born in the midst of excitement—they live in the midst of excitement, and soon as it wanes they generally sicken and die. They have no taste for religion that demands both reading and meditation as the food of its devotion, and greatly prefer those feelings which a warm exhorter can produce, to all the moral feelings, and refined and purifying sentiments and sympathies, which the truth believed and read, and pondered in the heart, can awaken within us. They are deluded by the idea that religion is the *effect*, and not the *cause* of feeling. Religion, with them, is the fruit of excitement, rather than the root and reason of it. Hence such converts display little or nothing of that constant and powerful excitement to love and to good works, which so visibly and constantly attended the profession of the faith in the New Testament age. The faith of Christ and the consequent hope and joy which simultaneously arise in the heart of a true convert, like the mainspring of a watch, or the *primum mobile* of any complicated machinery, set our whole frame in motion, and excite to every praiseworthy deed both towards God and man.

The Christian religion is, indeed, a religion of the purest, noblest, and most refined feelings and excitements of which our fallen nature is susceptible. It exerts a constant power upon all the affections and moral sensibilities of our hearts; but it is itself the offspring not of fancy, but of faith; not of excitement, but of reason; not of visions, dreams, or extraordinary impulses, but of the testimony of God, developed and confirmed by the Holy Spirit. It is, in one word, the effect of the Christian truth believed, and not the cause of faith: for it is faith, and not feeling, that works by love, that purifies the heart, and that overcomes the world. A. C.

Erwinton, December 3d, 1838.

BIBLE READING.

Nothing is more talked about amongst professors, and nothing is less practised, or indeed less understood, in proportion to its acknowledged importance, than the reading of the Scriptures. The Bible is, upon the whole and in general, in churches, families, and closets, a neglected book. It is, indeed, occasionally and statedly read in many churches and in many families; but it is not read rationally nor religiously; and, therefore, for the most part, fails in being relished, and

consequently in reaching the heart, and in being practically believed and understood.

To be read advantageously, the Bible must be read in the order of its books, at regular intervals, and with a solemn and religious reference to the most exact and full conformity in heart, in word, in action, to all its pure, and holy, and heavenly lessons and precepts. But even this is too vague and indefinite for the exigencies of the times. Permit me, then, to explain:—It was not the design of the Author of the Bible that men should have a synopsis or summary of its doctrine, either before their eyes in writing, or committed to memory. Had such been his design, he would have given us, by the hand of some inspired person, just such a summary as would have been complete and infallible. But he has not done it; and, therefore, such a document would be, to say the least, inexpedient and unprofitable. It would have been a substitute for the *constant reading* and studying of the Book. Now this is the very thing that the Author of the Bible does not desire. His will is that we be *constant* readers; that by the constant attrition or wearing of the truth upon our moral nature, our minds may be exactly conformed to the image of Him who breathes into us the Spirit of our God. It is impossible to keep any company long and constantly without catching its spirit and becoming assimilated. Equally impossible is it to be frequently in company with Moses and David, Isaiah and Jeremiah, Jesus and his Apostles, without catching their spirit. This is what God designs and desires in giving us the Bible to read. He would that we catch the spirit, rather than learn the doctrine, of this Holy Book. Now this is the philosophy of the fact, that there is no substitute for constant reading: for although all the precepts and promises, or the whole doctrine of the Bible could be learned or committed to memory, and faithfully retained, it could not serve that special and supreme intention of the Author of this Book, in giving it to us as the means of sanctification and of our being imbued and inspired with the Spirit of our God.

Fortunes, it is now well established, are generally the ruin of their inheritors. The exceptions are just enough to make it a general rule that riches are laid up for children to their hurt. It is cruel in fathers to make fortunes for children: for, in so doing, they deprive them of the pleasure of employing their talents as they have done, and thus throw them, in a great measure, idle upon society. They also prevent them of the pleasure of doing, and ultimately enjoying good; for we are so constituted that our powers of acquiring pleasure must ever be proportioned to our efforts in communicating it to others. And this is a work for which they are pre-eminently disqualified who are taught to live on energies not their own.

Hereditary orthodoxy, or fortunes of sound doctrine, made and bequeathed by our fathers, are still more fatal to their heirs than large inheritances of earthly goods and chattels. If sons are generally ruined in this world by large inheritances from their parents, they are, perhaps, as often ruined in the next world by large inheritances of orthodox sentiments and opinions, of which they are possessed by the *wills* of their ancestors, without the trouble of reading and thinking for themselves. There are not more helpless cases on earth than the heirs of orthodoxy; for they are infallibly right without evidence, without examination, without any concern of their own. These persons are

wholly unapproachable. They are right by necessity, by prescription, by inheritance, because they are right; and you are wrong because you are wrong, or because you dissent from them.

It is not intended by Him that rules in heaven, that we should possess either faith, knowledge, or grace by inheritance from our earthly or ecclesiastic progenitors. He intends that every man should dig in the mines of faith and knowledge for his own fortune—that every man should live and be rich by his own efforts. He thus calls forth and employs all our faculties, and affords us the pleasure of profiting by our own exertions. "If," says Solomon, "thou criest after knowledge, and liftest up thy voice for understanding; if thou seekest her as silver, and searchest for her as for hid treasures; then thou shalt understand the fear of the Lord, [true religion,] and find the knowledge of God," which is eternal life.

Bible reading is, therefore, as much an essential part of Heaven's scheme of human sanctification, as the giving of the Bible is essential to the communication of the light which it contains. There is no substitute for it. Sermons, prayers, conversations, catechisms, tracts, and each and every religious exercise superadded, can never compensate the neglect of Bible reading. It has a place, a power, and an influence peculiar to itself. There is a communion with the Father, and with his Son, our Saviour, attainable by means of this sacred reading, which is not vouchsafed to mortals in any other way.

But there is a critical reading of the Bible—a polemic reading—a sectarian reading—and a penance reading—which, however frequent and sincere, reach not within the circles of grace and spiritual enjoyment. The Bible is a sort of world in itself; and as mankind pursue and find many different objects in this wide world of nature and society, so Bible readers of all classes will find in it the respective objects of their pursuit. The politician, the jurisconsult, the orator, the rhetorical florist, the chronologist, the antiquary, the poet, the historian, the philosopher, the man of science, the artist, &c. &c. may all read the Bible with advantage to themselves and their professions; and, indeed, every class will find that in it congenial with its aims and designs in reading.

But a devotional and sanctifying reading of that sacred Book, is essentially different from the readings of the theologian, the moralist, the sectary, and the virtuoso of every caste and school. The man of God reads the Book of God to commune with God, "*to feel after him and find him*," to feel his power and his divinity stirring within him; to have his soul fired, quickened, animated by the spirit of grace and truth. He reads the Bible to enjoy the God of the Bible; that the majesty, purity, excellency, and glory of its Author may overshadow him, inspire him, transform him, and new-create him in the image of God. Such a reader finds what he seeks in the Bible as every other person finds in it what he searches for. The words of Jesus to such a one are spirit and life; they are light and joy; they are truth and peace. Such a one converses with God as one who speaks by signs. His readings are heavenly musings. God speaks: he listens. Occasionally, and almost inconsciously, at intervals he forgets that he reads, he speaks to God, and his reading thus often terminates in a devotional

conversation with God. The Lord says, "Seek you my face;" he responds, "Thy face will I seek." Thy Spirit saith, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul;" the Christian reader replies, "Open thou my eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law." The Spirit saith, "Blessed are they that keep his testimonies, and that seek him with the whole heart;" and the devout reader answers, "With my whole heart have I sought thee. O let me not wander from thy commandments." The Bible reading of all enlightened Christians generally terminates in a sacred dialogue between the Author and the reader.

There is a peculiarity attendant on this reading which I beg leave to remark with emphasis. The Author of the Bible is always present with his Book. This is not true of any other book in the world. Most authors are dead; and we sometimes regret that we cannot speak to them. But this Author for ever lives, and is for ever present; and, therefore, while we read his written word it is as natural as life sometimes to speak to him on certain subjects as they occur. "Truly, then, our communion is with the Father, and with his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord."

Christians, do you read the Bible in your families every day? Do you read it in your closet every day? And do you read it not to quiet your conscience as a work of penance; but do you read it as a pleasure anxiously to be sought after? If you do, I need not tell you what utility, pleasure, and happiness is in the blessed employment. But if you do not, you may rest assured there is something greatly wrong, which, if it is not abandoned, subdued, or vanquished soon, will cause you sorrows, if not agonies, when you will be less able to conflict with them than at present. Resolve this moment, I pray you, that you will begin to-day to read the Bible, to enjoy God and Christ and the hope of immortality. "Let not mercy and truth forsake thee, bind them about thy neck, write them upon the table of thine heart; so shalt thou find favor and good understanding in the sight of God and man." Then will you say with Solomon, "Happy is the man that findeth wisdom and the man that getteth understanding: for the merchandize of it is better than the merchandize of silver, and the gain thereof than fine gold. She is more precious than rubies, and all the things thou canst desire are not to be compared with her. Length of days is in her right hand, and in her left hand riches and honor: her ways are ways of pleasantness, and all her paths are peace." "Begin to-day: 'tis madness to defer." The religious world—I mean the great majority of all professors, are Bible neglectors. Their ignorance, prejudice, and error show it. I beseech you, daily, habitually, constantly, prayerfully read the Bible in its proper connexions, and you will grow in grace as you grow in the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ our Lord. The Lord will bless you, as he has said, in this deed. Read James i. 22—25., and may you prove it true!

A. C.

Erwinton, Barnwell District, S. C.
December 4, 1838.

OLD SCHOOL THEOLOGY;

Otherwise called Antinomianism.

Our old friend, Mr. Mark Bennett, in a late number of his *Primitive*, has thought proper to overhaul our theology, and in the same connexion has proceeded to edify his readers with a few lucubrations of his own. We should have preferred to see Mr. B. answer the questions already propounded before proceeding to other business; but as he has seen fit to do otherwise, and as we are disposed to gratify his propensity to the utmost, we shall hereby call his attention to a few more inquiries. We wish him to understand, however, that we have no idea of absolving him from his obligation to meet the questions already proposed.

In the article before us, Mr. B. informs his readers, that the gospel is exclusively "a system of promises and gifts"—that, in the gospel, "the sinner can live only by believing"—that "the gospel has nothing to demand, but all to give"—that "*faith* and *repentance* are purely gospel *gifts*," that they "are not commanding nor binding as duty upon sinners," and that there is neither guilt nor condemnation connected with their omission—that sinners *can* neither repent nor believe the gospel—and that "wherever there is the appearance of a command to believe or repent, it is but direction or instruction given"!!

For the edification of his readers we hereby request the aforesaid editor to answer the following queries:—

1. Has Christ a kingdom on earth? If he has, does he govern by laws, like other sovereigns; or only by "a system of promises and gifts"? If he govern by laws, where are they to be found—in the New Testament or somewhere else?

2. Are baptism and the Lord's supper enjoined in the gospel as *duties*, or are they only gospel "promises and gifts," which men are at liberty either to observe or to let alone, as may happen to suit their convenience?

3. On the subject of *doing* we read the following:—"Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that *doeth* the will of my Father who is in heaven." Matth. vi. 21. "And every one who heareth these sayings of mine, and *doeth them not*, shall be likened unto a foolish man who built his house upon the sand." Matth. vii. 26. "Faith without *works* is dead." James ii. 20. "When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and *obey not the gospel* of our Lord Jesus Christ." 2 Thess. i. 8. An exposition of these passages is requested.

4. On the subject of gospel *commands* we find the following:—"And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now *commandeth* all men every where to repent." Acts xvii. 30. Are we to understand from this, that sinners are commanded to repent; or are we to understand that they are only *advised* or *instructed* to do so?

5. On the subject of gospel *condemnation* we read the following:—"He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already; because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that *light*

is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." John iii. 18, 19. Are we to understand from this, that sinners are under obligation to believe in Christ, and that both guilt and condemnation are contracted by their refusing to do so; or are we to understand that faith is a gift, which may be either accepted, or set aside with impunity?

6. On the subject of *ability* we give the following:—"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark xv. 16. Agreeably to this statement faith is clearly indispensable to salvation. Is it to be understood, then, that Christ has made the sinner's salvation depend on his doing that which he has no power to do—on a mere contingency, over which he can have no more control than he had over the time or manner of his own birth? If so, can we be shown the equity of such proceeding?

7. If the sinner has power neither to repent nor believe the gospel, will Mr. B. please inform us why he preaches to sinners at all?—and in what they differ, so far as moral and religious obligation is concerned, from so many pine trees?

8. Finally, if the sinner has not power even to accept the "promises and gifts" of the gospel, can we be told what those promises and gifts are worth—or what can be the worth of that gospel which makes them known to the world?

Early and direct answers to the foregoing questions will no doubt be very acceptable to the readers of the *Primitive*. So soon as these points shall be settled, we shall probably be able to furnish our friend with a few more.

REMARKS ON THE ABOVE.

The preceding, from the "Biblical Recorder and Southern Watchman," conducted by our *courteous* friend Meredith, of metaphysical regeneration memory, is what we reformers would call a good common sense, rational, and "*biblical*" article—fully as *heterodox* as any thing we would wish to hear or read on the subject. We congratulate our friend on his redemption from the tyranny of super-oxygenated Calvinism, and are glad to find in him so able an advocate of the New Translation cause. He, certainly, has fully routed all the Baptist opponents of a new version of the sacred writings for home, as well as foreign distribution, amongst whom our quondam friend Dr. W. T. Brantly was chief, and is now successfully fighting the battle amongst his brethren of the South, which we had on our hands some dozen years ago. In his essays on these subjects will be found much good sense, much hard argument, and some improvement of manners.

I think our friend Lynd ought to catechise his brother Meredith on his Old School Theology; for surely he is as heterodox as I am on this subject: for if, as the seventh question affirms, "the *sinner* has power to repent and believe the gospel," all Mr. Lynd's necessity of

regeneration before faith, or assistance to believe, is as gratuitous and imaginative as assistance to see, or regeneration in order to vision, in the case of a person who has natural eyes and a natural sun. I am pleased to find that the Baptists in the South are being enlightened by our friend Meredith on various subjects, on account of introducing and discussing which, we have been so unjustly and unkindly treated by them of the North. It will soon be the popular doctrine of the South, that *a new heart is the* EFFECT, *and not the* CAUSE, *of faith.* This will be a full settlement of the controversy which we have introduced on the subject of the Spirit's preceding and accompanying power in order to belief. I never wished to push this matter any farther than Mr. Meredith has carried it in these eight interrogatories; and certainly will not debate with any man about his theories of supernatural aid who teaches that "*the sinner has power to repent and believe the gospel.*" A. C.

SAVANNAH, GA., December 10, 1838.

THE DIRECT AND IMMEDIATE INTENTION OF THE CHRISTIAN INSTITUTION.

ESSAY I.

THE immediate, proper, and practical intention of the Christian Institution is personal holiness, or a life entirely devoted to God—a life of fervent love to him, of sincere delight in him, of profound reverence for his glorious authority, of gratitude for his ineffable kindness, of admiration and adoration of his infinite excellencies: with a hearty and unlimited determination to do his will on earth as it is done in heaven;—that is, with a prompt, unwearied, and delightful constancy. In order to provide for and secure this divine intention, it enjoins the constant and diligent use of the holy scriptures, not only for private personal instruction and comfort, but also for family education, and church edification, as the proper and necessary means divinely appointed for those blissful purposes; that by *these* the heaven-born Christian might be "perfect, completely fitted for every good work." And as the divine word is the grand comprehensive means of personal sanctification, the diligent and proper use of it becomes indispensably necessary, for all that would enjoy this highly distinguishing and blissful privilege. We say, the *diligent* and *proper use* of it; for there is but one right way of doing any thing. Therefore, we may so use the scriptures as to abuse them: and this, we fear, too often happens. However, we do not think it necessary to our present purpose to attempt to describe or enumerate the various ways, in which the sacred oracles have been, or may be misused; but rather to ascertain the only correct and proper use of them; which will, in the mean time, answer every desirable purpose to those who wish to enjoy a life of holiness,—the supreme and blissful end for which they were graciously given. Now to make the proper use of any thing, we must use it for the very

purpose for which it was intended, and also in the proper manner to answer that purpose. Therefore, that we may enjoy the provisions of the holy scriptures for the blissful purpose for which *they* were intended, we must carefully and constantly advert to their direct and obvious intention, that so we may receive the instructions they were designed to communicate for said purpose. Wherefore we should distinctly and duly consider their moral and religious documents, that by a distinct and intelligent apprehension of these, we might be duly furnished for a life of holiness. Now *these*, we presume, may be evidently reduced to the following topics, viz.—1st. The knowledge of God. 2d. Of man. 3d. Of sin. 4th. Of the Saviour. 5th. Of his salvation. 6th. Of the principle and means of enjoying it. 7th. Of its blissful effects and consequences. That *these* are the grand comprehensive doctrinal topics, which the scriptures were specially designed to teach; and that in the knowledge, belief, and practical influence of *these* consists our present salvation, is evident both from the express contents of the Book, and also from the explicit intention of the salvation it exhibits: which is to turn men to God, and thus to fit them for heaven: see John xvii. 3, 17., with 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17., and Acts xxvi. 17, 18. "This is the life eternal to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.—Holy Father, sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth.—All holy scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be *perfect*, thoroughly furnished for *all good works*.—The people, and the Gentiles to whom now I send thee, to open their eyes, to turn them from darkness to light, from the power of Satan to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and an inheritance among the *sanctified*, through faith that is in me."

The means with the end being thus distinctly before us, what remains but that we make the proper intentional use of them? Wherefore, as oft as we open the blessed Book, it should be with the precise and real intention of acquiring a more perfect knowledge of these all-important topics; that so we might still be adding to our faith, and to the invigoration of those divine principles whence proceeds a life of holiness, and without the vigorous exercise of which it cannot be maintained. For surely our love of God, which is the radical principle of all holiness, cannot exceed our knowledge of his character; and this must consist in our knowledge of his works of creation, of legislation and government;—of redemption, reconciliation, salvation, and ultimate glorification of guilty, apostate, rebellious humans; and of the ultimate destiny of Satan and his guilty associates, whether angelic or human. For all these are the effects of his sovereign will, and so afford us a transcendant display of his glorious attributes—the essential properties of his nature, viz.—His knowledge, power, wisdom, goodness; justice, truth, holiness; love, mercy, and condescension;—his self-existence, independence, eternity, immensity, and immutability. And while, in the mean time, we are thus happily engaged in learning and contemplating the divine character, we also learn our own; we become truly acquainted with our origin, our nature, condition and destiny;—with the heinous nature, ruinous effects, and terrible consequences of sin; and, of course, with our inexpressible need of the

Saviour, which the love of God has graciously provided; and with the suitable adaptation of his salvation to our actual condition; and with the principle and means of enjoying it for our present relief and deliverance; and, lastly, with its blissful and glorious effects and consequences —which go to fill the believing soul with "joy unspeakable and full of glory." But it is not only necessary that we devoutly and studiously read and search the scriptures for the express purpose of acquiring this saving knowledge, but also that we perseveringly abound in these exercises: because we have not only to learn those things once for all, as we do the common arts and sciences for secular purposes; but to *live* upon them—to *feed* and *feast* our souls with the daily and diligent consideration of them, that so we may enjoy the heaven upon earth divinely intended for our present happiness; and thus be prepared for the enjoyment of a blissful immortality.

Wherefore, to realize and secure this heavenly enjoyment, we should not only make it our solemn intention and constant practice to search the scriptures daily, to ascertain the amount of the instruction they afford, upon each of the aforesaid topics; but we should also exercise ourselves unto godliness in frequent meditation and religious conversation on those all-important subjects, as well as in the conscientious performance of all good works; that in so doing, we may familiarize and enjoy the salvation of God. "Blessed is the man whose delight is in the law of the Lord;—who meditates on his law day and night;—all that he doth shall prosper." "The commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes: the statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart. More to be desired are they than gold; yea, than much fine gold; sweeter than honey dropping from the honeycomb;—in the keeping of them there is a great reward."—"O how I love thy law! It is my study all the day. I have more understanding than all my teachers; for thy testimonies are my meditation." "Thy word is a lamp to my feet, and a light to my path." "I found thy word, and I did eat it; it was the joy and rejoicing of my heart." "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly," "As new-born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word, that you may grow thereby." With those important items of the divine testimony, so expressly declarative of the peculiarly advantageous and highly blissful effects of making the proper use of the holy scriptures, we close this introductory essay upon the benign intention of our holy religion, with the pleasing hope that it may excite both the reader and the writer, to a more abundant use of the sacred oracles.

THOMAS CAMPBELL.

CHRISTIANS AMONG THE SECTS.

In a former essay I have said that I make *sincerity* the ground of a man's acceptance with God: but I have also said, that I have my own definition of sincerity: not that I have myself made a definition of the word; but that I have *adopted* the true *original* meaning. The original word, *elikrines*, rendered in the common version of the New Testament, "*sincerity*," is from *eile*, "sun-shine," and *krino*, "to judge or discern." Parkhurst thus defines the word: "Sincere, pure, unsullied, free from

spot or blemish, properly to such a degree as *to bear examination in the full splendor of the solar rays.*" The *sincere* man is, then, willing to bring *his head, his heart, his life* to the examination of light. If he has errors, he wishes them corrected; if he has ignorance, he wishes it removed; if he has guilt, he wants it purged away; if he has darkness, he wishes it chased away by the light of truth divine. He is the man described by the Saviour: "He that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be manifested that they are wrought in God:" or he exclaims with the Psalmist, "Search me, O God, and know my heart; try me, and know my thoughts, and see if there be any wicked way in me; and lead me in the way everlasting." This, and this *alone*, is sincerity. Latin authors give the same view of the word: deriving it from "sine cera," "without wax," originally applied to honey; of course, meaning "*pure.*" How widely different this, from the absurd popular sentiment, that, "let a man's opinions and conduct be what they may, yet, provided he be convinced that they are right, he must be justified in the sight of the Lord." With this view the fierce bigot, the persecuting zealot, the devout Musselman, and the idolatrous Hindoo, are all justified in the sight of God: or, as the ever-memorable Wilberforce expresses himself, after speaking of the "laborious subtleties" with which Bellarmine sought to justify the murder of certain heretics by Clement and Ravaillac, he says,—

"For sincerity, in its popular sense, so shamefully is the term misapplied, can be made the criterion of guilt and innocence on no grounds which will not equally serve to justify the assassins who have been instanced. The conclusion cannot be eluded; no man was ever more fully persuaded of the innocence of any action, than these men were, that the horrid deed they were about to perpetrate was not lawful merely, but highly meritorious. Thus Clement and Ravaillac being unquestionably sincere, they were therefore indubitably innocent. Nay, the absurdity of this principle might be shown to be even greater than what has yet been stated. It would not be going too far to assert, that whilst it scorns the defence of petty villains, of those who still retain the sense of good and evil, it holds forth, like some well frequented sanctuary a secure asylum to those more finished criminals, who, from long habits of wickedness, are lost alike to the perception as to the practice of virtue; and that it selects a seared conscience and a heart become callous to all moral distinctions as the special objects of its care. Nor is it only in profane history that instances like these are to be found, of persons committing the greatest crimes with a sincere conviction of the rectitude of their conduct. Scripture will afford us parallels: and it was surely to guard us against the very error which we have been now exposing, that our blessed Saviour forewarned his disciples: 'The time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think he doeth God service.'

A principle like this must then be abandoned, and the advocates for sincerity must be compelled to restore this abused term to its genuine signification, and to acknowledge that it must imply honesty of mind, and the faithful use of the means of knowledge and of improvement, the desire of being instructed, humble inquiry, impartial consideration, and unprejudiced judgment. It is to these we would earnestly call you; to these (ever to be accompanied with fervent prayers for the divine blessing) scripture every where holds forth the most animating promises: 'Ask and ye shall receive, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you.' 'Ho! every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters.' Such are the comfortable assurances, such the gracious encouragements to the truly sincere inquirer."

But if I have failed to establish the position—"The man whose will and affections are bowed to the divine *will*, (however imperfectly he may understand that *will*,) is an acceptacle worshipper of God;" or, *lest some doubt should remain* in the mind of some reader, I will endeavor to make the matter still more apparent by inquiring, Who is the man whom the law of the Lord condemns? Human laws can only take hold of overt acts; but the law of the Lord enters the heart—it takes cognizance of motive—"it is a discerner of the thoughts." "He that looketh on a woman to cherish impure desire, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." And again—"He that *hateth*

his brother is a murderer," though he should never grasp the instrument of death. The assassin who assailed Prometheus, the Thessalonian, was to all intents a murderer, although he saved the very life (by probing a deadly wound) he intended to destroy.

It is thus that the law of the Lord detects sin while it is yet a seminal principle. It proposes to purify the *fountain*, in order that the *streams* may be pure. "Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life," is an oracle of divine wisdom. And to this even the intelligent of the ancient Pagans agreed, as the following quotation from Juvenal fully shows:—

"A Spartan once the Oracle besought
To solve a scruple which perplex'd his thought,
And plainly tell him if he might forswear
A purse of gold entrusted to his care.
Shuddering, the Pythian answer'd, 'Waverer, no;
Not shalt thou for the *doubt* unpunish'd go!
With that he hasten'd to restore the trust;
But fear alone, not virtue, made him just:
Hence he soon proved the Oracle divine,
And all the answer worthy of the shrine;
For plagues pursued his race without delay,
And swept them from the earth like dust away.
By such dire sufferings did the wretch atone
The crime of *meditated* fraud alone!
For in the eye of Heaven a wicked deed
Devis'd, is done. How, then, if he proceed
To perfect his device, how will the offender speed?"

In the mean time, to fill up my present essay with quotations, I shall conclude with the words of a late English writer. In descanting upon the laws of our Saviour and King, he says,—

"These laws differ from all others, not only in the originality of their principles, and in the altitude to which these principles arise, and in the pervading extent to which they go; but in this, above all, that, not resting the offence in the degree, but in the spirit, they establish it not by evidence of fact, but by evidence of conscience anterior to fact. It is the state of passionateness in the soul, not the thousand passionate acts; it is in the state of vindictiveness in the soul, not the thousand vindictive acts; it is in the state of wantonness in the soul, not the thousand impure acts; it is in the state of insincerity in the soul, not the thousand breaches of covenant;—in these first conceptions of evil, which are, as it were, each the root of a wide-branching tree, the lawgiver of Christians finds, the criminality to exist. As if the mind were a soil into which, if these seeds be admitted, they must necessarily grow and bear fruit and propagate their kind to an indefinite extent. Seeing, then, that into the secret place of the heart nothing penetrates but conscience and the eye of God, these two alone can arbitrate the matter. Evidence, therefore, on which all conviction in human institutions ought alone to proceed, is here clean out of the question. The crime is perpetrated long ere it proclaims itself to the perception of the nicest judge. The law is addressed to the spirit of man, from which nothing is hid of its own designs or transactions, of which designs and transactions not the thousandth part do see the light. So that Christ's laws, though a thousand times less numerous, apply to a thousand times more cases than the laws of man."

CHRISTIANOS.

News from the Churches.

Felicity, Ohio, August 27, 1838.

The good cause we plead is advancing gloriously in some sections of this country. The church near Harmonsville, Brown county, has had numerous accessions lately: the pre-

cise number I do not know. At one meeting, a few months past, 23 persons were added, mostly by immersion. Few meetings pass but more or less have been added; so that I think I am safe in stating that within one year or eighteen months there have been nearly one hundred additions, and prospects are still encouraging. O that we were better circumstanced in reference to Evangelists! I have long been of opinion that if we could get in New Testament order upon this subject, the cause of our common Lord would run and be glorified. JOHN T. POWEL.

Stanford, Ky., August 30, 1838.

I have been requested to communicate to you the recent success of the glorious gospel of our blessed Redeemer in this part of our guilty country; and I with cheerfulness comply, believing that through your periodical many of our beloved friends may be informed of the progress of truth and be made to rejoice and take fresh courage in the Christian warfare. The annual meeting of the congregations in this portion of this state was held in Lancaster, in Garrard county. On the 17th inst. the meeting commenced. Brothers J. T. Johnson, Thomas Smith, Curtis Smith, Callahan, and Begg attended. Brother Johnson labored zealously for the original method of receiving the glad tidings of salvation, sometimes addressing the people three times in the same day. The other brethren assisted in exhortation and prayer. A very large number of persons attended, and seemed to hang with interesting attention near the stand from whence the truths of the gospel were proclaimed. Their efforts were not fruitless; for notwithstanding the strong sectarian opposition, many persons being convinced of the truth, came boldly forward to make the good confession that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and Saviour of sinners, and to renounce all governments but that of Heaven—believing the sacred writings are fully adequate to all the purposes of present and eternal salvation. It was a glorious time. Christians came up from every direction to worship in the congregation of the Lord, and sinners added to the rejoicing of the saints by joining in the army of King Jesus. On the Lord's day nearly 400 brethren surrounded the Lord's table and participated in the memorial of our great Leader. It was a prelibation of the great assemblage of the saints, when the Lord shall gather his elect out of every kindred, tribe, and people under heaven, when they shall come from the East, from the West, from the North, and from the South, and sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven. "There the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are at rest. They hear not the voice of the oppressor; the small and the great are there, and the servant is free from his master." Then shall the poor man cease from the burdens of his wearisome life; no more shall he hear the insolent calls of the master awaking him from needful slumber on his bed of straw, nor be hurried away from his homely meal to undergo the repeated labors of the day. But with a golden harp he shall join the angelic band, and tune it to the praise of our glorious Redeemer through the ceaseless annals of eternity.

O glorious day! O blessed hope!
My soul rejoices at the thought,
When in that holy happy land
We'll take no more the parting hand!

The meeting continued 7 days, and 28 were added to the army of the Lord. Brothers Johnson and T Smith then came to this place, where, in 3 days, 10 submitted to the requirements of Heaven and joined the people of God. Many persons attended here likewise. The field is ripe for the harvest; and, O if we had laborers, how soon might pure and apostolic religion prevail, and blind devotion to the institutions of men be driven from the land! Party increase should not be the object, but the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom. Schisms and animosity, prejudice and bickering ought to be banished from this land of liberty; and every follower of the Lamb should take the laws of his Prophet, Priest, and King for his only guide. O may the day speedily come, (and it is no doubt coming apace,) "when the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters do the great deep"—"when every man in every face shall meet a brother and a friend!" L. M. COX.

Middleburg, Logan county, Ohio, August 31, 1838.

We have just concluded a four days' meeting in this town. The result was, 20 were added by immersion. The laborers present besides myself, were, M'Manis, Vanvoorhis, and Hathaway. Our number now exceeds 100 in this congregation. For several weeks before the meeting there were regular accessions. It is at once pleasing and instructive to see how matters work. The Methodists have been doing all in their power to put down immersion; but the more they preach against it, the more the people disbelieve them. I immersed nine Methodists this week! Brother Ballinger, (to whom you will remember I addressed an epistle a few months ago through my periodical,) is now a member of this congregation, and is constantly rejoicing in the Lord. These, with us, are truly times of rejoicing! If any thing can be determined from appearances, then do the brethren here love one another.

A few weeks ago I attended the great meeting at Kenton, O., with brother William Dowling. The meeting terminated with six immersions. The congregation there numbers about 50. Prospects are good all around. May all the holy brethren continue to walk in the truth! A. CRIHFIELD.

Centreville, Bourbon county, Ky., September 11, 1838.

The gospel of our blessed Lord still continues to triumph gloriously in Kentucky At a meeting held near Sugar Ridge meeting-house, in Scott county, embracing the 2d Lord's day in August, and continuing some seven days, I am informed that about 30 or upwards obeyed the Lord. I was only permitted to be with them one day, and had the satisfaction to see 16, I think, come forward to confess Jesus. Brother Johnson was the chief laborer. Passing by several meetings held in our vicinage, at which in all many bowed to the Lamb of God, I would mention an interesting meeting I recently attended at May's Lick, at which, in company with brother J. Irvin, I had the pleasure to meet our beloved brethren Richard C. Ricketts, John Smith, and Callerman. Some 13, in *all*, came forward either for immersion or to unite with us on gospel principles—having been previously immersed. On my return home I stopped at brother Bailey's, near Millersburg, and addressed a large audience. One young man confessed the Lord. At night I preached in town, where an aged lady owned her Lord and Saviour. The young gentleman was immersed that night by the fair moonlight, a crowd attending—the old lady, next morning.

I reached home on Wednesday last. Our great yearly meeting at Cooper's Run, near Paris, commenced on Friday last, and terminated yesterday evening. About 12 in all came forward, four of whom had been previously immersed. One of the others, an intelligent Presbyterian, a gentleman and a scholar, came to demand immersion. Some competent persons supposed there were at least 1000 communicants on Lord's day, and that the number of persons on the ground was about 4000—probably not so many. The public speakers present during the meeting were, brethren Thomas Smith, J. T. Johnson, John Rogers, Richard C Ricketts, Aylett Raine, Josh. Irvin, F. W. Emmons, Curtis Smith, Benjamin Hall. William Parker, brother Ely, L. J. Flemming, brother Whittington, John Tuffe, William Morrow, George W.. Williams, John Ross, and A Gano.—Peace, harmony, and love greatly prevailed throughout the meeting, and I trust that much good fruit will yet be seen to result from the labors of the brethren on the occasion. There were present members from very many churches in this and the surrounding counties, who brought us a vast amount of written or verbal intelligence with regard to their numbers, increase, order, condition, and prospects. It appeared that the total increase in those heard from just around here, was more than 1300. Their order is decidedly better, bad as it yet is, than heretofore, and the prospects encouraging. Love and peace seem generally to prevail • O Lord, blessed be thy holy name for the glorious and and mighty deeds thou hast done and art still doing in our land! Keep us in the spirit of humility and love.

Our next *annual meeting*, the Lord willing, is to be held at Millersburg in this county, to commence on the Friday before the 2d Lord's day in September, 1839.

JNO. ALLEN GANO.

NOTE.

The statement from Mr. John Thomas, alluded to on page 11, has not yet come to hand, and consequently will not be found in the present number, which is now going to press, and is already delayed beyond the usual time. R. R.

ADVERTISEMENT.

Brandywine, Shelby county, Indiana, Nov. 22d, 1838.

Brother A Campbell—

We, the undersigned, wish you to publish the following in the Millennial Harbinger, for the benefit of the brethren and the public in general:—

Dr. *Spencer K. Milton*, who professes to be a Preacher of the Reformation, left this county in July last; and, from letters recently received from him by his friends in this county, we believe he is in the state of Illinois. From the best information we can get, he owes between three and four hundred dollars in the counties of Marion, Rush, and Shelby, in this state, and rode off and sold a horse that he had pledged to brother Woodyard; and, worst of all, he has left his wife, who is unable to work for a living, after having deprived her of the principal part of her clothing and all the means of getting money, except by the sympathies of strangers. We would just state, that from the acquaintance we have had with him, we believe him to be a common liar, hypocrite, and impostor, and that he has left his wife without any just cause; and while he continues the present course of conduct he should not be countenanced by either Christians or Infidels. We think it unnecessary to say any thing more concerning his immoral conduct, as this is enough to let his real character be known to the public.

T. Q. MATTHEWS,	BISELL BURR,
JOHN HEINSMAN,	WM. SLAUGHTER,
OVERTON JENKINS,	JOSIAH JOSLIN,
ANDREW SURBER,	ADONIJAH MORGAN.

Since writing the above, I saw a letter written by him to his brother in Rush county, stating that he never intended to live with his wife, and expected in a few days to start to Arkansas or Texas. T. Q. MATTHEWS.

FORRESTER & CAMPBELL,

BOOKSELLERS AND STATIONERS,

No. 117, Wood street, Pittsburg;

ARE prepared to fill orders for the following BOOKS;—

HYMN-BOOKS, plain and fancy bound.

POCKET TESTAMENT, New Version.

TESTAMENT and HYMN BOOK, in one volume.

DEBATE WITH M'CALLA ON BAPTISM

The price of the Hymn-Book is reduced to 25 cents per copy. A discount allowed to those who purchase large quantities.

N. B.—New editions of the Family Testament and Christianity Restored may be expected during the present year.

January, 1839.

PROSPECTUS OF THE CHRISTIAN BANNER.

B. F. Hall and R. Rains propose to publish in the city of Lexington, a Religious and Literary Paper, to be denominated

THE CHRISTIAN BANNER.

This paper will advocate the divine authenticity of the Sacred Scriptures, and the religious, moral, and social duties.

Several gentlemen, of considerable theological and literary attainments, have promised to contribute sermons, essays, and addresses to our paper, on such subjects as come within our design.

TERMS.

1. *The Christian Banner* will be a weekly paper, printed on a fine super-royal sheet, in quarto form, convenient for binding. It will contain, in a year, more than twice as much reading as the Millennial Harbinger, more than four times as much as the Christian Preacher, or Evangelist, and more than one and a half times as much as the Heretic Detector.

2. Price per single copy, *Two Dollars and Fifty Cents* in advance, or on the receipt of the first number; otherwise *Three Dollars* will in all cases be required. Post Masters who act as Agents, will be allowed 10 per cent for obtaining subscribers, and for collecting and remitting the amount of their subscriptions. All other persons who obtain and pay for *eight* subscribers in advance, shall have an additional copy gratis.

3. No subscriber shall be allowed to discontinue only at the end of the year; nor shall any one be permitted to withdraw, unless at the discretion of the Editors, until all arrearages are paid. All who do not notify their discontinuance to our Agents in time for them to inform us a month before the close of the year, will be considered as subscribers for the ensuing year.

4. Letters to be addressed to *The Christian Banner, Lexington, Ky.*, in all cases *post-paid*. We do not want a subscriber who does not intend to pay, nor an Agent who will charge us with the postage of his letters. The postage on a letter will be trifling to each person writing; but to us, *all* would be a heavy tax.

We have concluded to undertake the publication of a *weekly* paper, not for pecuniary advantage, but at the request and oft-repeated solicitation of many of our brethren and friends, who think we should have one such paper, when our opponents have so many, and are getting up another in our immediate vicinity, to be conducted by one of our bitterest enemies, for the avowed purpose of opposing this reformation. And we are confident there is liberality enough among our brethren bountifully to sustain such a paper, and zeal enough to make them exert themselves to give it a wide circulation among friends and opponents.

Will the following brethren act for us as General Agents, in appointing for us Agents, and remitting us moneys? A. Campbell, P. M. Bethany, Brooke county, Va.; A. Crihfield, P. M. Egbert's, Logan county, Ohio; M. Winans P. M. Jamestown, O.; C G. M'Hatton, P. M. Georgetown, Ky.; W. Hatch, M. D. Agent of Bacon College, is our Travelling Agent in Kentucky. Brother John T. Johnson will also appoint Agents, obtain subscribers, and collect money for our paper. Our Evangelists in Kentucky have generally promised to do the same. All our Evangelists and Elders, in every state, province, &c. and others who desire to aid in promoting the interests of the Redeemer's cause, are requested to become Agents for the Christian Banner.

All subscriptions should be returned by the 25th of December, or as soon thereafter as possible. We will begin to publish by the first of January next, or as soon as we obtain a sufficient number of subscribers to justify the undertaking.

Some of our brethren have already become responsible for 50 copies, some for 10, and others for 5. How many others will do as well, or better?

All who wish to take *The Christian Banner* can send their names without being called on by an Agent. Persons disposed to act as Agents are requested to do so without sending for a Prospectus. Their seeing it published in any paper is authority sufficient for them to act. Agents will retain the Prospectus and forward us a list of their subscribers' names, and the Post-Office to which they wish their papers sent, *distinctly written*.

☞ Our brethren of the editorial corps will please insert the above Prospectus in their respective papers.——*Lexington*, Nov. 10, 1838.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER,

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME III.—NUMBER II.

BETHANY, VA. *FEBRUARY*, 1839.

THE PARABLE AGAINST THE SADDUCEES.

A PLEDGE was given some months since concerning the interpretation of this parable. I deferred the consideration of it for reasons known to those to whom the promise was made. All debate upon the subject having ceased, I hasten to redeem that pledge. I will give Dr. Campbell's version of the parable as it is written in the first of the four Evangelists—Matt. xxii. 33–33.

"The same day Sadducees came to him, who say that there is no future life, and thus addressed him: Rabbi, Moses has said, if one die and have no children, his brother shall marry his widow, and raise issue to the deceased. Now, there lived among us seven brothers: the eldest married, and died without issue, leaving his wife to his brother. Thus also the second, and the third, and so to the seventh. Last of all, the woman died also. Now, at the resurrection whose wife shall she be of the seven; for they all married her? Jesus, answering, said to them, You err, not knowing the scriptures nor the power of God; for in that state they neither marry, nor are given in marriage: they resemble the angels of God. But as to the revival of the dead, have you not read what God declared to you, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not a God of *the dead*, but of *the living*. Now the people who heard this, were struck with awe at his doctrine. Meantime, the Pharisees hearing that he had *silenced the Sadducees*, flocked about him."

Before we enter upon this parable we must have a New Testament view of the controversy pending in those days between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, a full account of which we find in the Acts of Apostles, chap. xxiii. and 8th verse:—"The Saddu-

cees say that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit; but the Pharisees confess both." Josephus also gives the same testimony, as well as other contemporaries, of this sect. They all represent the Sadducees as teaching that there is no future life—that at death body and spirit both die, and return not again. Now, it must be emphatically noted, that though the points of difference between the Sadducees and Pharisees are *three*, they are not *co-ordinate* points: two of them are *consequential*. The denial of the resurrection of the body, was not the cause, but the effect of their denial of angels; and the denial of angels was not the cause, but the consequence of their denial of spirits. They denied angels, because, in the argument with the Pharisees, it was shown that *angels were spirits;* and they denied the resurrection of the body, because they denied that there was any ghost, guest, or spirit to inhabit it. Hence the grand points of Sadduceeism, like the grand sectarian points in all parties, are reducible to a unit. They simply denied that the spirit of man could exist out of his body; and that, consequently, there were no disembodied spirits in the universe. They did not deny that a man had a spirit in this life; but they maintained that this spirit was essentially mortal, and died with the body. The Pharisees, on the other hand, maintained that the spirit did not die with the body, but always lived. Some of them taught that the spirits of the dead not only survived their first bodies, but also inhabited other bodies—as Pythagoras taught his disciples.* They were not, however, so well agreed in this matter, as they were in the fact, that the spirit survived the body, and could not possibly die. In arguing against the Sadducees they strengthened themselves by arguing from the angels who were ministering *spirits;* and as angels could live either in bodies or out of them, they argued that so might human spirits. Thus stood the controversy in the times of Jesus and the Apostles. The Sadducees maintained the mortality of the human spirit, and therefore denied the existence of disembodied spirits, and consequently the resurrection of the body. Now, that they erred in affirming

* Allusions to this Pythagorean notion are found in the New Testament: "Lord, who sinned, this man (in some former body) or his parents, that he was born blind (in this body) Again,—Some say you are John the Baptist (in a new body,) or some of the dead Prophets. John ix. Matth. xvi.

the mortality of the human spirit, or in denying the revival of the dead and the resurrection of the body, we very logically infer, as I conceive, from the fact, that Jesus and Paul were Pharisees so far as these questions were involved: for, says Paul, "I AM A PHARISEE" A Pharisee? Wherein? In the points at issue with the Sadducees: for, says Luke, Acts xxiii., the Pharisees confess the points which the Sadducees deny; and, therefore, when Paul cried out, '*I am a Pharisee*,' it was in those points mentioned—namely, the existence of disembodied spirits and the resurrection of the dead.

Now, the great masters of controversy in every department of debate, always attack the radical principle of the heresy or party, and attempt the confutation of it, rather than to go into the details of the consequential errors emanating from it. This view of the matter fully explains the argument of the Messiah against the Sadducees in the passage under examination. He knew at a glance the fundamental error of the party, and directly assails that. The resurrection of the body, and the existence of angelic spirits, he well knew were but consequences flowing from the assumed mortality of the human spirit; and, therefore, the whole debate resolved itself into a single question,—Do the dead *revive?* Do they live after death in any mode? And here it ought to be noted that the word *anastasis*, now appropriated to the *body*, to its being raised out of the grave, before, and ever since, thus appropriated, simply denoted *revival*, or restoration of any thing dead, fallen, or oppressed. Indeed, the first time it occurs in the New Testament it is used in this sense, Luke ii. 34. "This child is set for the fall and rising again," or for the revival of many in Israel. The word *anisteemi*, from which it branches, is also often so used. So that, as Dr. Campbell justly argues, it should in the parable against the Sadducees be translated *revival*, rather than in the appropriated sense, *resurrection* of the dead.

The whole debate, we have said, is resolved into a single question: Do the dead still live, or do they live again, or revive after death? This is the point to which the great Prophet directed the minds of the Sadducees who sought to puzzle him by the oft-repeated case of the woman and her seven husbands —

Concerning the question, "Whose wife shall she be of the seven?" he only says, There is no longer husband or wife after this state. In the other state they neither marry nor are given in marriage. But as touching the *revival* of the dead, their living again, or being still alive, after death, have you not *read*, said he, what God *declared to you*, saying, I *am* the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. "God," continues he, "is not a God of *the dead*, but of *the living*." This, then, proves that the dead are now alive; but it does not prove the resurrection of the body. It proves what Luke adds to his version of this parable, that "they all (though dead) are alive to God." The Sadducees were silenced—the Pharisees triumphed. Both parties saw and felt the point of the Messiah's refutation; but on the hypothesis that this relates to the special question of the resurrection of the body, where is the proof?—! Jesus does not say that God is the God of those that are dead, but who shall hereafter live; but he is the God of the *living:* yes, the LIVING—those now in life. The conclusion is inevitable, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob are *now* living—"though dead to us, they are alive to God." And if Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, are now living, the *revival* of the dead is certain, and Sadduceeism is an error.

The Pharisees, to a man, felt that Jesus was on their side and against their opponents. Paul, too, confessed that he was a Pharisee on these questions; and, so far as these matters extend, all Christians may be Pharisees, and be blameless. But we have not yet dismissed the parable. Jesus gave the whole three points of Sadduceeism a fatal blow. While he struck at the root, he also cut the branches. The *revival* of the dead is proved by a natural comment on what God said to Moses at the burning bush. The resurrection of the body is also clearly asserted, and vindicated from the difficulties growing out of marriage and fleshly relations. And that angels are *immortal spirits*, is most unequivocably asserted. And here we ought to remark that the Sadducees had no objection to angels, provided only that they were not *spirits*. for they would say, that the winds and lightnings were God's angels; that the plague that slew the first born of Egypt was an angel, but not a spirit. Their sectarian antipathy was against *spirits*—against disembodied spirits—

against immortal spirits. They denied angels as immortal spirits. They regarded the sirocco, the simoom, the plague, the tempest, the fire, the flood, as angels of God; but those angels that were *spirits*, immortal spirits, they could not explain, and would not admit. That a man had a soul and a spirit they also admitted, but that either could exist in a disembodied or separate state, they positively denied. Their opposition to angels and human spirits is found in the idea of their immortality. It is one and the same objection against an angel and a disembodied living spirit. They were both immortal, and that implied a *future state*—a state of rewards and punishments; and against this the Sadducean spirit revolted. Here lay the secret of all their antipathies. Jesus, then, in the parable asserts the resurrection of the body, *proves* the *revival* of the dead, and declares the *immortality* of the angels: for in Luke's version of this parable, he quotes from the Saviour these words, omitted by Matthew and Mark: "Neither can the raised saints die any more; *for they are equal to the angels.*" Angels, then, cannot die. But why cannot *angels* die? Because they are *spirits*, and not because they are messengers. The angels, says Paul, are *ministering spirits*. Immortality, then, is theirs; not as *ministers*, but as SPIRITS. Thus the Saviour routes the Sadducees in every point, and affirms three propositions opposite to their three—the revival of the dead, or that the dead live; the immortality of angels as spirits; and the resurrection of the body; and, consequently, a future state of happiness and punishment.

All this, indeed, is implied in many other phrases in the New Testament, of which we cannot now speak particularly. We shall only give a few examples of the fact, that *bodies*, and not spirits, are raised from the grave:—"It is sown a natural *body;* it is raised a spiritual body: for there is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." 1 Cor. 15. "If the spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies, because of his spirit that dwelleth in you." Rom. viii. 11. "Joseph craved the *body* of Jesus." "Pilate gave his body to Joseph, and he wrapped it in linen and laid it in a sepulchre hewn out of a rock." Mark xv. 43.; Luke xxiii. 52, 53. "And the women

beheld how his body was laid in the sepulchre." xxiii. 55. "On the first day of the week they entered the sepulchre, and found not the body of Jesus." xxiv. 4. "And when they found not his body, they came." "And the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves and appeared to many." Matth. xxvii. 52, 53. Not spirits, but bodies, are said to arise and come out of the graves.

This only to corroborate the interpretation of the parable, or to justify a Christian in preferring the Pharisaic to the Sadducean side of this controversy. There is this special advantage in understanding this ancient heresy—that it enables us to settle controversies about the future state, or the existence of disembodied spirits, by the testimony of the Apostles and the Saviour, rather than by our own reasonings on the subject: for having found on which side they stood, we are sure we are right when we find ourselves with them, and against their opponents, as we evidently do on the present occasion. And this is better than a hundred arguments deduced from philosophy, or any other source, on this important subject. A. C.

Erwinton, S. C. December 14, 1838.

INCIDENTS ON A TOUR TO THE SOUTH.

NO. II.

MEETING-HOUSES, UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA, JEFFERSON'S GRAVE, &c.

I DO not wish to expatiate on the unfortunate circumstances and causes that have prostrated the influence of the church in the city of Richmond, especially as there is much reason to hope that those who have contributed to this state of things have so fully eaten of the bitter fruits of their own doings, as not to be soon hungry again for such another repast. The brethren that have held fast their integrity, and rode the storm, are doing much to recover what has been lost. Meanwhile, they need such an evangelist as brother Henshall to spend all his time in the city, above all that the church can do in her stated meetings for her own edification. Churches in large cities, those great haunts of men, either need many prophets and teachers, or evangelists, if not for their own sake, for the sake of those without, who will not attend without some other inducement than most of such societies now offer. True, indeed, that for the time some of these

churches have existed, they ought to be able to interest the whole community; yet, owing to their former bad education, and the want of such senior brethren, as are apt to teach, they can exert almost no influence on surrounding society. In this state of things most churches in large cities feel the necessity of having at least one meeting every Lord's day, besides on week evenings, for the proclamation of the word. Without this part of the evangelical machinery, many fish that might have been caught in the gospel net, are lost for ever. If the proclamation of the word of the Lord be needful any where in Christendom, it is especially so in large cities. Ignorance, poverty, and crime, for the most part abound in cities, and live near neighbors to overgrown wealth and great literary intelligence.

From the residence of our kind host, brother Waller, on the 1st of November we left Richmond for Charlottesville, via the Louisa rail road, and were conducted by our good brother Coleman to the residence of brother Goss, who was recovering from a severe attack of bilious fever. Brother Goss and brother Poindexter, of the church of Charlottesville, are, it is said by those who have often heard them, very acceptable speakers, and well calculated to exert a strong and good influence on the side of reformation. They have a great deal in their power, and owe much to the kind dispensations of the heavenly Father for abundant opportunities of eminent usefulness. I pray that they may be found good stewards of the manifold favors of God bestowed upon them. The church of Charlottesville is quite an interesting community, and has a good and comfortable meeting-house, which may be visited without doing penance, as is too generally required in Eastern Virginia, and in all the South, so far as I have witnessed.

Meeting-houses do not generally resemble *Bethels*, or else the Lord keeps the poorest houses in the country. For my part, I cannot associate the idea of a flourishing spiritual temple, and that of an open, leaky, tottering, windowless, stoveless, wooden tabernacle as its residence. It is so much like princes dwelling in cottages, or kings in huts, that its incongruity staggers my weak faith in the sincerity, spirituality, and devotion of those who cheerfully acquiesce in such accommodations. Those splendid, rich, and gorgeous things, called Temples and Cathedrals, fitted up in all the vanity and pride of life, are not a keener satire on the meek and lowly Jesus, than are these dilapidated, cheerless, cold, and ruined places, called Christian meeting-houses, which one too often sees in those regions. They seem to belong to no party; for they are found in all. The owners of these unsightly domicils of religious worship generally live in comfortable mansions, and some of them in princely dwellings; and yet it seems never to have occurred to them, as it did to

David, how unseemly it is for them to dwell in houses of ceda while the ark of God sits under the ragged curtains of an old tent

I cannot but think that our houses for worship ought to be as comfortable places of meeting, to say the least, as the private dwellings of the average class that frequents them. Alike removed from the appearance of magnificent display, and that of sordid, cheerless, squallid poverty, they ought to be neat, clean, comfortable, convenient for winter and for summer, for saint and for sinner: so that all who visit them may feel perfectly at home, and, without distraction or inconvenience, attend upon the stated means of illumination and sanctification. Good and convenient meeting houses are indispensable to the full enjoyment of our Christian privileges, and to our usefulness in the world. True, indeed, that times of persecution and great distress sweeten and consecrate the desert, the mountain cavern, the deep valley, the cottage or the cave; but in times of external ease and prosperity we need synagogues, meeting-houses, and all other conveniences to induce and encourage all to frequent the places of prayer and the ministry of the word. We especially need them on another account—because, without them, in many places, we cannot be heard at all. We are often forbidden to stand on the consecrated ground of sectarian orthodoxy; and are, therefore, under greater obligations to provide ways and means for the free and full proclamation of the word.

While on the subject of meeting-houses, it may not be inexpedient to add, that there is less science displayed in this species of architecture than in any other that has ever fallen under our view. Theatres, lecture rooms, court-houses, legislative halls and almost all other sorts of buildings, have incomparably more science and philosophy apparent in their construction and arrangement than our houses of worship. Pulpits are supremely absurd. The speaker ought always to be the lowest man in the house for three reasons;—that he may have the best air, for he needs it most; that he may be most easily seen; and that he may be most distinctly heard. No man of science will ask me for an explanation of this matter. They are plain philosophic deductions from facts well established, and now generally appreciated. But it ought to be stated that this arrangement pre-supposes always that the floor be an *inclined plane*, of one foot in every eight, or, at most, ten, of its whole length. The ceiling ought never to be very high. If not inclined to suit the floor, it ought not to be more than from twelve to sixteen feet high. No galleries, of course: windows large, and made to ascend and descend that the room may be ventilated above or below, as circumstances may require.

Stoves are generally misplaced in places of worship. They ought never to be near the speaker. I have got many a ser

throat and heavy cold from these life-destroying machines. Instead of being placed within a few feet of the stand, with their pipes on each side of the speaker, as in the meeting-house in Charlottesville, and then red as Nebuchadnezzer's furnace, they ought to be near the doors to meet the cold air on its entrance, and always heated one hour before the congregation assembles. The house being warmed while empty, when filled with people but very little fuel will be enough to make the congregation comfortable during an ordinary discourse, or session for worship. I am thus particular because I contracted a cold and hoarseness at Charlottesville from these causes, or was confirmed in one begun on my way thither, from which I was a month in recovering; and this was neither the first nor second time that I have been prostrated from the same influences. I lost the Lord's day in Charlottesville, and one or two appointments, in consequence of this unfortunate cold, which I much regretted, especially one in Farmville, Prince Edward county, where, as I learned, an immense concourse from three or four counties were disappointed.

I made a short visit to the University of Virginia, and had an introduction to its rich and extensive library, and to several members of its Faculty, by one of its most gifted and distinguished members, Professor Rogers, with whom I had formed a very agreeable acquaintance on the way from Richmond to Charlottesville. Professor Rogers is doubtless one of the most learned geologists in the United States, and is likely to develope to the Old Dominion various sources of wealth, spending, as he now does, a part of every year in exploring the mountains and vallies of Middle and Western Virginia by authority of the State. But it is not in geology alone that Professor Rogers excels: he is profoundly read in all the branches of natural science.

The University of Virginia is, upon the whole, a very splendid institution. Its localities are well selected; and its architectural designs, execution, and general taste reflect great credit on the distinguished mind of its illustrious founder. All the Grecian Orders—the Corinthian, the Doric, the Ionic, the Tuscan, appear to be in good keeping with one another, and with the whole plan and its spacious accommodations; and are, upon the whole, the best specimen of good style and taste that we have seen in the United States.

But better still, the students in attendance at present, and the number is very respectable, (say 250,) it is said, are exceedingly studious, orderly, and attentive to their business. From being at one time supposed to be altogether Jeffersonian in moral principle and religious belief, the Faculty, visitors, and students are all converted into a church-going community; and so reli-

gious has the whole University become, that they have for some years past placed themselves under the episcopacy and spiritual care of a Chaplain. The happy effects of this system are already felt in the good behaviour of the students, in the increasing popularity of the University, and in the growing confidence of parents and guardians in placing their sons and wards under its tutelary and salutary administration.

But there is a new sort of quadrangular orthodoxy got into this institution which must ultimate in its becoming a sectarian establishment. The Chaplain must belong to some one of the four angles of a parallellogram: he must be an Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Methodist, or Baptist. There are but *four* ways to heaven from the University of Virginia; and whoever will not choose some one of the four, must go to perdition. Hence the students failed in all their efforts to have me deliver them an address in the University during my visit to Albemarle. True, indeed, most of them heard me in the village; but they could not hear me within the walls that Thomas Jefferson consecrated. They asked the Chairman of the Faculty, a worthy Methodist, Mr. Harrison, son of my room mate during the Virginia Convention, Dr. Harrison, of Rockbridge; who told them to ask the Chaplain. The Chaplain told them to ask the Faculty; the Faculty told them to ask the Visitors; the Visitors to ask I know not whom: but so it was, they kept the students praying all the time I was in Charlottesville; but no one answered them. After my departure, as I since learned, they held several meetings; and by a vote of *four* to *one*, condemned the whole plot and actors in the farce of quadrangular orthodoxy. But the spice of the whole matter is, that the students pay the Chaplain out of their own pockets, and the Faculty, or Visitors, or somebody chooses him for them.

But the question is, By what chapter and verse in the book of Kings, or by what statute of the commonwealth of Virginia, or by what suggestion of Thomas Jefferson, are the four elect sects placed over the religious and moral culture of all the Virginia youth who frequent this state institution!! I will guess it is by none of these; but by the address of the Episcopalian sect, who expect ere long to be masters of the institution. A majority of the Visitors are Episcopalian. The policy is now to invite the other three parties, two of which have but few learned preachers, (and none else will be elected to address the students;) the Presbyterians are very few, and can seldom attend; and thus the Episcopalians will, in process of time, by this pretended liberality, possess themselves more effectually of the destinies of the University than by seeking it directly and immediately. I learned hat there are in the University, at this time, some twenty

students, sons or relatives of members of our society, in and out of the state of Virginia, who are thus compelled to bow down to the new image which the genius of Jefferson has set up, or else be a proscribed caste amongst their fellow students. I would humbly move that the authority by which these things are thus arranged be placed before the citizens of the whole commonwealth.

We thought it due to the sage of Monticello to visit his residence and tomb, distant from Charlottesville only some three or four miles. On arriving at the family sepulcres we were no little disappointed in finding every thing about them in ruins. The dilapidated fence—the frame of a gate swinging in the air—the posts and bars prostrate on the ground—the tottering monument—the broken tomb-stone, trodden by the swine—all seemed to say,—

> ——— ——Here lies, "in this neglected spot,"
> Some Arnold guilty of his country's blood;

rather than, *Here lies the Author of the American Declaration of Independence.* But so it was, Jefferson's remains and those of his wife, lying upon his right side, on the west side of a bleak mountain, are literally in the commons, as if to illustrate the words of Blair—

> ——"Sure there's not a dungeon slave
> That's buried close by the high way side,
> Unshrouded and uncoffin'd, but lies as soft
> And sleeps as sound as he."

Ought not the nation, the state of Virginia, or the citizens of Albemarle, to pay some attention to this deserted piece of ground!! The humble granite monument that marks the spot where lie his ashes, has no inscription but "Was born April 13th, O. S. 1743—died July 4th, 1827.*" There is no nominative case to the verb, unless the granite slab be supposed to speak for itself. Did Mr. Jefferson or his heirs presume that all the world would for ever find, by intuition, the subject of this verb!! What eccentric folly!

From the grave, accompanied by brethren Coleman, Poindexter, and some ladies, we went to the Monticello House. It also appeared to be hasting to ruin. There is nothing interesting but the site. The view is exquisitely grand and elevating. The mountain scenery on the west and north is exceedingly magnificent, and the immense expanse towards the east is not to be surpassed in any country, except where some lake or river variegates and beautifies the scene. Water is all that is wanting to make it one of the finest landscapes, or rather a collection of the finest landscapes, we have ever seen. Still the levelling of the

* I may not have the dates correctly, as I took no notes.

mountain top, and the patchwork appearance of the edifice standing on a sterile and exhausted farm, gives to the whole the appearance of a splendid failure, and betokens that the proprietor was rather ideal and imaginative than practical and sound in his views and undertakings. Of the wisdom of his other theories, it is to be hoped that time, that great interpreter of all human efforts, will speak more favorably than of those that appear to have been cherished by the occupant and proprietor and improver of Monticello.

We spoke only four times in Charlottesville; twice at Scottsville; twice at Sandy River Church, in Prince Edward; and twice in Lunenburg county to the brethren of Springfield and Concord churches; and once in the Theatre in Petersburg; besides our speaking in Amelia county, as mentioned in our last. We found many excellent brethren in these vicinities, and were happy in being instrumental in bringing about a reconciliation of several difficulties which had for some time retarded the progress of the cause of reformation in those regions. We hope to hear that brother Silas Shelburne and brother Thomas, and others with them, are successfully employed in gathering fruit unto eternal life, and that the Lord is by them adding to the church many that are saved. Such laborers are those most wanting in all places. I cannot but hope that the discussions held at Painesville will fully satisfy all, that where the Bible is silent we ought to be as silent as the grave; and when it speaks often and clear, we ought to speak with corresponding clearness and frequency. May the Lord bless all who are led by the Bible! A. C.

Augusta, Ga., Dec. 19, 1838.

CHRISTIAN UNION.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 25.]

If, then, the example of Christ is the great evangelical principle of action, pertaining to ecclesiastical order and fellowship, the following important questions cannot be of difficult solution:—

1st. WHAT HAS ANY CHURCH, PROFESSING TO BE A CHURCH OF CHRIST, A RIGHT TO REQUIRE AS A CONDITION OF ADMISSION TO ITS FELLOWSHIP AND PRIVILEGES?

Not an agreement in sentiment, certainly. This is not the condition on which Christ receives and fellowships individuals. To imitate his example, is to demand the same condition of fellowship and communion that he does, and no other. A uniformity of sentiment is not to be expected in the church, at once, on all points of the Christian faith. We should tolerate those diversrties of sentiment which Christ tolerates. To act otherwise would be to affect a greater strictness and purity than he observes. How justly does the celebrated *Robert Hall* remark,

when he says, "There are certain propositions which produce on a mind free from prejudice such instantaneous conviction as scarcely to admit of formal proof. Of this nature is the following position—That it is presumptuous to aspire to a greater purity and strictness in selecting the materials of a church, than are observed by its Divine Founder; and those whom he forms and actuates by his spirit, and admits to communion with himself, are sufficiently qualified for the communion of mortals." Hence the answer to the question proposed is perfectly plain—No church has a right to require any other condition of admission to its fellowship and privileges than that on which Christ receives and fellowships individuals. And that condition is *simple faith* in Him. This, then, is the only authorized condition of church fellowship and communion in Christ's house. All other conditions are *unauthorized*, and at open war with the Great Head of the church.

Let this principle be adopted by all the churches professing to act by the authority of Christ, and it would lead to the abandonment of all their unauthorized arrangements; to the abrogation of all their human laws; to the relinquishment of all their self-made tests of membership; to the disbanding of all their warring parties; and to the most cordial and hearty reception of all who give evidence of having been received by the Saviour. Then those who are *'weak in* the faith will be received, but not to doubtful disputations.' Then there will be in the most perfect exercise, a reciprocal toleration and indulgence when there are diversities of opinion that are not inconsistent with salvation.

2d. WHAT IS FUNDAMENTAL IN RELIGION?

The light of the above principle will conduct us with unerring certainty to the proper answer of this question—That only can be fundamental which involves the condition on which Christ receives and fellowships individuals. This condition is admitted on all hands to be faith in him as the Saviour. So that no man errs *fundamentally*, unless his error involve disbelief in Christ. Therefore, to make any other points *fundamental*, is an unauthorized assumption, not to be tolerated in the church.

3d. WHAT SHOULD CONSTITUTE A SUFFICIENT REASON FOR WITHDRAWING CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP FROM AN INDIVIDUAL?

Not every error in doctrine, or delinquency in practice. This would not be *imitating* the example of Christ: for this he never does. A clear and scriptural evidence of the previous withdrawment of fellowship by Christ, is the only justifiable reason for our dissolving the bonds of fellowship with any individual. To eject a person from our communion whom we have evidence to believe Christ still fellowships, is a most daring resistance of God. We are bound to forbear with a brother's errors and imperfections as long as we have reason to believe Christ does. When his errors in doctrine or delinquencies in practice are inconsistent with Christ's fellowship, his relation with the church must be dissolved.

4th. WHAT IS HERESY IN RELIGION?

This question can be easily solved in the light of the above principle. We have seen that to receive all whom Christ receives, is the supreme law of the church. To deviate from this, and form a sect among Christians on account of certain diversities of opinion on points not essential to salvation, is the *heresy* of the Bible. Heresy and

sectarianism were words of the same import in the primitive church. They were considered as synonymous terms by our translators. The Greek word *airesis* they have sometimes rendered by the word *sect*, and sometimes by the word *heresy*. Paul was accused by Tertullus of being a "ring-leader of the sect of the Nazarenes." In his defence he admits that, "in the way they called *heresy*, so he worshipped the God of his fathers." To make this part of his vindication pertinent, *heresy* must mean the same thing as *sect* in the accusation of Tertullus; and should have been so translated. This is the only *proper* rendering of the word *airesis* as used in the New Testament. We are supported in this opinion by Drs. Clark, Campbell, and many others. Dr. Campbell very justly observes, that "an undue attachment to one part, and a consequent alienation of affection from another part of the Christian community, comes under the denomination of *schisma*. When this disposition has proceeded so far as to produce an actual party or faction among them, this effort is termed *airesis*. And it has been remarked that even this term was at that time currently applied when matters had not come to an open rupture and separation in point of communion." This, he says, is evident from the application of the term by Paul to the state of things that existed in the Corinthian church, at the time he wrote his first epistle. They had not, at that time, come to an open rupture. If that *heresy* was so strongly denounced by the Apostle, with what terms would he reprobate that which is so fearfully prevalent at the present time?

Heresy, then, is to act contrary to the example of Christ—wantonly rupture the bonds of Christian union, and create or prepare the way for a faction in the church. The man who would do this was to be "rejected after the first and second admonition." To infringe the great law of Christ's house, break up its order, sunder the ties of spiritual consanguinity, and form jealous and rival parties among the saints, or *evince a disposition to do so*, was considered a crime of such magnitude as to be incompatible with Christian character. Hence, such a one was to be rejected after proper admonition. Titus iii. 10. If such characters deserved such treatment, in the morning of the church, are they deserving less at the present time? And if the sin of creating, or of endeavoring to create, factions in the church, is so atrocious as the voice of inspiration declares, then is not their *existence* a great sin? And if so, are not those who compose them chargeable with great sin for perpetuating them? This must be perfectly evident. Although they may not be as culpable as those who brought into existence the sects of which they are the component parts, yet they are far from being innocent. They are, in a fearful sense, *heretics* according to the primitive import of that term.

The way is now prepared to answer the last question proposed; namely, *In what should this union consist?*

From the remarks made, it will appear evident that it should not consist in a *unanimity* of sentiment on all points of scripture truth. But the union the gospel contemplates and enjoins, is adapted in its very nature to produce a perfect unanimity of belief in all points of evangelical truth. Sectarianism has the opposite tendency. It is fitted to produce the greatest possible diversity of opinion among Christians in relation to truth. Therefore, to remedy the discordancy of

sentiment in the various churches, Paul invariably insisted on the most perfect union. This he regards as the only efficient remedy.

He showed the Ephesian brethren that the great object of the organization of the church was the perfecting of the saints, the work of the ministry, the edifying of the body of Christ, till they all came into the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God. This object could only be secured by their remaining perfectly united under one head, under the instruction of one spirit, and governed by the same rule. But this course would conduct them most directly to the 'unity of the faith.' Let the same course be pursued now, and the same results would follow. There must be discussion in the church. Christian union would not prompt us to be insensible to the errors of those composing it. Error must be met in the church as well as out of the church. Mind must conflict with mind. But truth will gain nothing without union; error will gain every thing without it. Let union among Christians be effected, and they would soon arrive at the 'unity of the faith.' But let sectarianism continue its march, and this desiable *goal* can never be gained.

And it is equally plain from the positions assumed, that this union should not be one of denominations, *as such*. The existence of these is a violation of the fundamental law of the church. They are so many wrongs; and wrongs should not be *united*, but annihilated.

But in what should this union consist? It should consist in a union in fundamental truth—a union of affection—a union of feeling—a union of interest—a union of object—a union of effort—a union of hopes—a union of desires—*a union in visible church relation*. In a word, it should consist in such love reigning in the hearts of the saints, as will subordinate every other principle to its sway, so that they will unite in all the acts the authority of Christ imposes upon them, and live in the most perfect visible communion and fellowship. This is the union the Bible enjoins. This is the union that must be effected, or the world is lost.

IV. Human Creeds.

From the principles elucidated in the preceding remarks, it must be perfectly obvious that human creeds, occupying the place and subserving the purposes they do in the church, are at variance with the great law of Christ's house, and should be forthwith abandoned. A synoptical view of the sentiments of a church we do not particularly object to, provided it is not considered as binding upon any one.

Our objections to human creeds will be briefly stated in the following order:—

1. No real benefit can be derived from them They do not keep error out of the church, because they are all, more or less, erroneous. This is introducing it into the church. The Bible would be much better to keep error out of the church, because it contains no error. To say that they are more explicit and plain than the Bible, is to charge the Holy Spirit with incompetency. To say they are more *concise* than the Bible, and therefore to be preferred, is to allege that the Bible is redundant. We are aware that human creeds are so *concise*, that they contain little else than human speculations. To say that they are a necessary bond to bind Christians together, is to deny the efficacy of Christian love. 'Love is the bond of perfectness.' It is the *only* divinely constituted bond of union.

2. Their tendency is evil, only evil, and that continually. The history of the church, from the time of the fabrication of the Nicene Creed, until the present period, is a continual demonstration of the truth of this position.

3. There is no divine warrant for their use, either from precept or example. And the reason is very obvious: inspired truth, unmodified and uncommended, was the only authorized constitution of the church.

4. They are the fruits of an unauthorized and sinful legislation in the church. Christ has never vested the legislative power in the church. That power he has wisely reserved to himself. That creeds are legislative enactments no one can doubt. They are made the laws of the church.

5. They supersede the Bible. This is evident from the fact, that they constitute the basis of sectarian churches and ecclesiastical judicatories. Persons for admission are examined by the creeds. All their judicial proceedings are conformed to the same rule. Delinquents are tried by the Creed, and not by the Bible.

6. They tend most powerfully to perpetuate the enormous evils of sectarianism. Specifications here are unnecessary.

7. They eject real Christians from the church. A change of views which is acknowledged not to affect the Christian character of a person, is a sufficient reason for his ejectment from the church, according to the creeds. Thousands have been cast out of the church for no better reason.

8. They prevent real Christians from coming into the church. They cannot *conscientiously* comply with all their self-made terms of membership. Thus the privileges of the church are denied to the members of Christ's body.

9. They prevent an increase of scriptural knowledge. If a man have imbibed errors, it is *disorderly*, according to the creed, to retract them. If he shall gain any new light, he must be regarded as a heretic, and be treated accordingly. The creed stands with a drawn sword to prevent any member of the church advancing in the way of scriptural knowledge. It will not allow the mind to transcend its narrow limits. All beyond is forbidden ground.

10. They are almost invariably made by the few, and imposed on the many. A few in one generation will fabricate the systems of faith for all coming generations. To question their infallibility, in ages afterwards, is regarded as truly schismatical in the Protestant, as it is in the Catholic church, to question the infallibility of the Pope.

11. A desirable Christian union cannot be effected while they hold their present place in the church. They stand directly in the way of such a union. Their unauthorized terms of fellowship can never be complied with. They conflict with each other. So that creeds must be discarded, or the hope of the formation of a gospel union among Christians must be relinquished

12. It is rebellion against the great Head of the church to retain them. It is rebellion to leave the divine Constitution of the church, and make a human fabrication the rallying point. It is rebellion against the King of Zion to set a new and inhibited standard of action in his church. *His example* is made the only standard of action. To set up another, is most clearly to rebel. *To receive men as he receives them*

is our great law. To receive them as Calvin, as Wesley, or as Fuller receives them, is a new and rebellious law in the church.

Therefore, creeds should be immediately discarded. To permit them to hold their present place and subserve their present purposes in the churches, is unsafe—is productive of immense mischief, and is incompatible with submission to the prerogatives of Christ.

V. Ecclesiastical Bodies.

We believe that standing ecclesiastical bodies, aside from the church, are without scripture warrant, and of dangerous tendency. It is evident that the churches of the primitive ages of Christianity had no *ecclesiastical organization* connecting them together in bonds of affiliation. They were little independent republics, amenable to none but to their great Head. There were no bodies over them, or connected with them, claiming appellant jurisdiction, or assuming legislative powers; nor were there any standing ecclesiastical bodies of an advisory character. This is admitted by many who claim the right of forming such associations. Mosheim affirms that "all the churches of those primitive times, until near the end of the second century, were independent bodies, none of them subject to the jurisdiction of any other. Each church was a little independent republic, governed by its own laws, which were enacted, or at least sanctioned, by the people. For though the churches founded by the Apostles were often consulted in different cases, yet they had no judicial authority, no control, no power of giving law. On the contrary, it is as clear as the noon day, that all Christian churches had *equal rights*, and were in all respects on a footing of equality. The meeting at Jerusalem, as given in the book of Acts, was only the conference of a single church. The councils of delegates of the churches to consult for the common good, were first held near the close of the second century. This custom arose in Greece, and was an imitation of the political councils which had long been known there." The history of such bodies has taught us to beware of making expediency the ground and reason of action in things pertaining to the church of Christ. There is no safety for the church, but in adhering strictly, tenaciously, and perseveringly to the great principles of ecclesiastical order and arrangement established by the Lord Jesus Christ. If any special emergency, like that which convened the saints at Jerusalem, should occur, let the churches and ministers assemble, and having the Holy Spirit, let them adopt measures adequate to the emergency. To go beyond this, is to act without any divine warrant, and to endanger the rights and interests of the church.

CONCLUSION.

These are the principles we warmly cherish—fervently regard, and cheerfully recommend to all Christians as being, in our opinion, the only principles of church fellowship, order, and discipline developed in the gospel system. These are the principles that constitute, as we believe, the *only* scriptural basis for the union of the saints. Let these principles be adopted and acted on by all bearing the Christian name, and sectarian strife, party animosity, and denominational conflicts and divisions would cease; and a church of perfect symmetry, harmony, and beauty would arise to make glad the city of our God, and to bless a ruined world.

[The Convention appointed the same committee as before, and adjourned SINE DIE.]

EVILS OF SECTARIANISM.

HILLSBOROUGH, King & Queen, Va., Dec. 28, 1838.

Beloved old brother T. Campbell,

LEARNING from brother Alexander when he was at my house, you would attend to the Harbinger, I address you as the Editor.

My mind has been much occupied upon the state of the churches in Eastern Virginia. I have witnessed a state of things that I could not have believed upon the prophecy or sayings of any *uninspired* man. I have endeavored to search out the cause that has introduced or brought about such a state, and find it is owing to a loose and regardless attention to the plain written word of God. You are not to understand by this state of things, that I have the most distant thought that the principles of this reformation can possibly fail in triumphing over all aberations, imperfections, schisms, apostacies, or contentions of its advocates; or over the oppositions, reproaches, councils, decrees, anathemas, misrepresentations, persecution, or banishment by men or angels. No, sir, I am well persuaded, were every advocate at this day to apostatize, the principles we are now contending for would ultimately triumph. And why? Because they are nothing more nor less than the teaching of Jesus Christ and his Holy Apostles. We do say, we have never as yet seen or read of any man, or set of men, hazarding their all, since the grand *Apostacy*, in such a cause as we are now engaged in.

What are we doing? Trying to pull down those *calves* that modern *Jeroboams* have set up in "the high places" to keep the Israelites from going to Jerusalem, the only place God has recorded name, or will meet with such as are desirous of worshipping him, lest they should return to their lawful duty, and become one people.* Why did Jeroboam make his calves and put them in the high places? Read the unerring word. It is true, the cause was first owing to Solomon's suffering his wives to turn away his heart from God's word. Then his son Rehoboam *forsook the counsel of the old men*, and hearkened to the counsel of the young men. After Rehoboam was crowned king over Judah and Benjamin, and Jeroboam over the other ten tribes, Jeroboam knowing

* See 2d chapter of Acts, the constitution of the first Christian church. 1 Thess. ii. 14. Do read the 122d Psalm; also, the 137th. Jerusalem was the *throne* of the Lord. See also Micah iii. 17.

that Jerusalem was the place where God had recorded his name, and that thither should all his true worshippers come, "said in his heart, Now shall the kingdom return to the house of David; if this people go up to sacrifice in the house of the Lord at Jerusalem, then shall the heart of this people turn again unto this Lord, even unto Rehoboam king of Judah. Whereupon the king took counsel, and made *two calves* of gold, and said unto them, *It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem;* behold thy gods, O Israel! which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt. And he set the one in Bethel, and the other put he in Dan." (Mark it, reader.) "And this thing became a sin for the people, and they went to worship before the one, even to Dan." See chapter xii. first book of Kings. Now let any man show, if he can, a better reason than that assigned by Jeroboam, why Israel should not have gone up to Jerusalem. The same reason Jeroboam assigned will now apply to every sect in the professing Christian world, so called. Let any of the sects show, if they can, that God has ever approved of the conduct of the ten tribes from that day to this, and see the conclusion of the 13th chapter of the same book of Kings.

But, my beloved brother, my object is to call the attention of the disciples to God's dealings with the two tribes, *Judah* and *Benjamin.* There was war always between these two tribes and the ten tribes. When these two tribes faithfully adhered to the law of Moses, they were *always conquerors.* But, alas! what is man in his best estate? "And Judah did evil in the *sight of the Lord*; and they provoked him to jealousy with their sins they had committed, above all that their *fathers had done.*" Let our quondam brethren remember this. "FOR THEY ALSO BUILT THEM HIGH PLACES, AND IMAGES AND GROVES, (their traditions,) on every high hill, and under every green tree." What followed? An army took possession of all the treasures of the house of God. Beshac, king of Israel, had to build fortifications to keep the Israelites from going out or coming in to king Asa of Judah * Let us here learn a lesson, brethren. Asa, as his heart was perfect with the Lord his God all his days, took away the altar of the strange gods, the high places, and broke down the images, and cut down the groves, and commanded Judah to seek the Lord God of their fathers, and to DO the LAW and the COMMANDMENTS, dismissed his mother from being queen, and destroyed her idol. What follows? He goes out with two hundred and fourscore thousand men against Zerah, the Ethiopian, with a thousand thousand, and three hundred chariots. "Asa cried unto the Lord his God, and said, Lord, *it is nothing with thee to help, whether*

* Are not the councils and decrees of the sects tantamount to the conduct of Beshac, king of the rebellious tribes?

with many, or with few that have no power: help us, O Lord our God; for we rest on thee, and in thy name we go against this multitude. O Lord, thou art God; let not man prevail against thee." Their enemies were subdued. Mark, brother, what follows. "The Spirit of God came upon Azariah: he came out and met Asa, and said unto him, Hear me, ye Asa, and all Judah and Benjamin; *the Lord is with you* WHILE YE BE WITH HIM, and if ye seek him he will be found of you; BUT IF YOU FORSAKE HIM, HE WILL FORSAKE YOU." See the 15th chapter, 2d book of Chronicles.

Here is a lesson for us. Did Asa attend the word of God spoken by the Spirit of God? Read the 16th chapter, 2d book of Chronicles, and see the weakness, or, as it is said, the foolishness of Asa. After he forsook God he could not bear a reproof from the Prophet Hanani, and cast him into prison, and oppressed some of the people. Has nothing similar been of late performed by our quondam brethren—that is, as far as they could go? See the close of the life of king Asa. But more of this, and "Christians among the sects," hereafter.

THOMAS M. HENLEY.

HINTS TO YOUNG CONVERTS.

PRIDE.

As there is no Christian attainment more difficult than humility, so there is nothing by which young converts are more easily overcome than Pride. This is natural. It is long before the neck can pleasantly bear the yoke of Christian self-abandonment, or the heart yield an unreserved submission to the Divine pleasure. When self esteem, itself misguided, has in turn long misgoverned the empire of human thought and human action, it is apt, even when dethroned, to set up a new tyranny amidst the immature and weaker principles of a youthful Christianity; like Dionysius who, when expelled from Syracuse, became the keeper of a school, that he might, as one of the ancients has observed, still continue to be a tyrant. It is indeed hard to renounce the world with all its lusts and pleasures, but it is still a harder task for a man to become a new character and renounce himself. Hence the young convert who has as yet but imperfectly learned this lesson, is often the subject of scripture admonition, and is regarded by Paul as ineligi-

ble to the bishop's office. "Not a new convert," says he, "lest being puffed up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil."

Although a dogmatic confidence, and a self-sufficient arrogance are not unusual characteristics of those who have just zealously adopted any system of religion, we have reason to expect these demonstrations of pride to be still more conspicuous when that system is, or is supposed to be, the only true one.—When men content themselves with false or corrupted religions, and, conscious of either the mutual weakness or the equal strength of their respective fortifications, make with each other the child's bargain, 'Let me alone and I'll let you alone,' there is little room for either boasting or applause. It is when men suppose their defences impregnable, and their forces invincible, that they hoist the flag of proud defiance, or enter upon a war of extermination. Infallibility indeed is the very element in which pride 'lives, moves, and has its being.' Hence the fierce fanaticism of the Mahometan, and the intolerant bigotry of the Roman Catholic. And hence it is that they who have embraced primitive Christianity, are peculiarly liable to the influence of a dogmatic and censorious spirit: for, resting, as they do, upon the express declarations of the scriptures alone for their faith and practice, they cannot but regard their religion as the only one possessing divine authority, and all other systems, as such, imperfect or corrupt, whatever they may concede to the sincerity, morality, or piety of those individuals who, for want of better information, have adopted them. Nor would we oppugn the propriety of these convictions. There is no stronger proof of the degeneracy and seriously diseased condition of modern Christianity, than that insensibility to the sectarian malady which preys upon its vital energies—that tame acquiescence in existing error, so grossly misnamed charity, and so popular at the present day. And the very fact that the Mahometan and Roman Catholic religions retain the striking feature of infallibility, and the unyielding firmness of an uncompromising spirit, is an evidence that they are the early, though imperfect imitations of that primitive Christianity which, conscious of its heavenly origin, admitted no rival claims, and made no alliances with earth-born usurpation. Our

only object, however, in adverting to the peculiar position which the young converts to the ancient gospel thus occupy, is, that perceiving how it subjects them to the workings and influences of spiritual pride, they may be more especially upon their guard against them.

This pride displays itself in a complacent admiration of our own superior sagacity in making choice of so perfect a system; and our self-gratulations upon the attainment of the exalted privileges it confers. Regarding all other systems as false or corrupt, we treat them and their supporters with supercilious arrogance; and should they not admit the exclusive merit of our views, we first wonder at their stupidity, then suspect their motives, and at length insult them with offensive epithets or invidious comparisons. We make no distinction between the system, and its originators and abettors; nor between these and the multitude who are innocently misled; but involve the whole within the scope of our sweeping conclusions, and visit the sins of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generations. Yet in the meantime, whatever our arguments may prove as to the strength of our understanding, or the correctness of the form of religion which we have adopted; our angry, contentious, and overbearing manner betrays that the heart is uninfluenced, and the temper unchastened by its spirit.

Nor is this evil passion unlikely to lead the person who is under its influence away from even the true doctrines of religion. He longs to distinguish himself, but the simplicity of the gospel being such that it is readily understood by all, and fails to furnish novelty as a stimulus to curiosity, or deep and sublime discoveries to gratify the love of the marvellous, he finds it unsuited to his purpose. He feels disappointed that the revelations of God contain nothing that is not more or less useful or necessary to men in their present condition in this world. Like Archimedes, he would move the world; but like him, in order to do this, he discovers that he must get out of the world. Hence if a *cloud* will not afford him a footing sufficiently substantial, he will endeavor to find a fulcrum for his lever somewhere in the *new heavens*, or perchance within the purlieus of the *New Jerusalem* From the lofty position which he thinks he has attained,

ne imagines that he can discern new worlds and grand and magnificent scenes before unknown; and while he amuses the vain and frivolous with his far-fetched speculations, he is apt under the influence of pride, to spurn in the midst of his reveries, like Alnaschar in his vision, that which might have been the foundation of a better fortune—the simplicity of truth.

Pride is truly a dangerous and insidious passion. Through it, Satan himself fell from his high estate. It is the master-spirit of all opposition to the divine will, and the concentration of human and angelic guilt. Under its influence a man loses all sense of relative duties and moral obligations. He thinks so highly of himself, that he can find nothing sufficiently worthy of his merits. He demands the highest respect from others, but disregards the duties which he owes to them. Their rights, their understandings, their feelings are despised and trampled upon, while his own are invested with supremacy. In short, he conceives that he does honor to others in condescending to receive their hospitality, their property, or their homage. Hence a man may become too proud even to be honest; and the extortioner, the highwayman, and the robber may appropriate to their own use the goods of others, only because they think too highly of themselves.

Humility, on the other hand, is a lovely attribute of character. It is the brightest charm of human excellence, and the perfection of Christian beauty. It teaches men to place a becoming estimate upon their own merits, and those of others. It quickens their sense of duty, and enhances the power of moral, relative, and social responsibilities. It furnishes the antidote to human misery. It inspires gentleness, affection, and respect towards others, and receives in turn the kindness it bestows. And like the tender ivy, which, though it seem lowly and insignificant, can attain to the loftiest elevation; humility, encircling the majestic pillar of the divine faithfulness, can reach the highest pinnacle of the temple of honor and fame. In a word, it is this noble characteristic which elevated the Man Christ Jesus to the throne of the universe; so that we may say of Pride and of Humility in the language, though not in the sense, of the Poet—

"This rais'd a mortal to the skies—
That brought an angel down."

Let the young convert, then, consider the apostolic precept, 'That no one should think more highly of himself than he ought to think;' or, 'Let each one esteem another better than himself.' Again, Paul says, 'Mind not high things;' 'In meekness instruct those that oppose themselves, if God peradventure may give them repentance to the acknowledgment of the truth;' and Peter,—"Clothe yourself with humility, for God resisteth the proud and giveth grace unto the humble." And, finally, let him show that he believes in the infallibility of his religion by practising the humility which it teaches. R. R.

From the Advocate.

THE RECONCILIATION.

In conformity with the earnest solicitation of many brethren in divers parts of Virginia, and in full accordance with my own disposition, which has ever been anti-partizan for the sake of things not essential to the realization of the One Hope, I visited Richmond, that, if possible, the infelicitous dissensions between myself and brother A. Campbell might be composed on terms commendable to the heads and hearts of both. The formalities of recognition having been disposed of, our intercourse was renewed. The consummation, however, which has since been developed, renders it unnecessary as well as undesirable, that the details of our correspondence should be recorded; it may, perhaps, be sufficient to observe, that though the current of our exchanges were unequal, politeness forbade the manifestation of any other than the most courteous demeanor.

Nothing having been accomplished, I left Richmond, having previously agreed to meet brother Campbell at Sandy River Church, in Prince Edward. This, however, was inconvenient; I, therefore, sent a messenger with a letter, and a message, that I would be at Springfield, in Lunenburg county, where he had appointments on Saturday and Sunday following. But this meeting did not take place, in consequence of brother Campbell sending me word that he would be at Paineville, in Amelia, about eight miles from my residence, on the Monday after, where he would be glad to see me. I received this intimation on Friday night; and on Sunday I learned from brother Walthall that he had received a note from brother Campbell from Charlottesville, and that although brother C. had declined visiting Paineville, yet as he had read through my debate with Mr. Watt since he had left Richmond, he would hold meeting there for one or more days, commencing on Tuesday, for the purpose of discussing my views as therein set forth, and that I should have the opportunity of reply, &c.

Accordingly, on Tuesday morning we met at brother Tinsley Jeter's; where, after discussing until late, it was at length agreed that brother C. and myself should hold a formal debate upon three several propo-

sitions in relation to the mortality of man, the resurrection of the dead, and the state of the wicked after their destruction. Moderators were appointed; I was placed upon the affirmative of these propositions; the rules of the discussion were agreed to; and we then entered upon the business before us, for the elaboration of truth, and *not for victory*.

Many brethren desired that the proposed debate might be put on record; but brother Campbell expressly stipulated that it should not be reported. I am not at liberty, therefore, to communicate to my readers the arguments adduced pro and con. Suffice it to say, that we discussed our subject until the third day about 2 o'clock. Till that time we were still upon our first proposition, with but little prospect of agreement on either side; nevertheless, we can both appeal with confidence to the candor of our brethren and the public to say, if ever they witnessed a debate between two, who had been years in opposition, conducted with such propriety, equanimity, and good humor. Rarely, we believe, has it been known that variant theological disputants have concluded their discussions with opposite conclusions, and have yet become, not only better friends than they were before, but even brethren by a mutual recognition; yet such has been the consummation of our debate, to the surprize, and mortification, perhaps, of those who know not the influence of the truth, and who batten upon the feuds of this present evil age.

About 2 o'clock a recess was agreed to, that the congregation might refresh herself. During the interval, the brethren got together and discussed among themselves the propriety of continuing the debate. They considered that there was much on both sides worthy of grave investigation, but that the points themselves, though important, ought not to be made matters of public debate and misunderstanding *between brethren;* who should, as they conceived, devote their time, talents, and enterprize to a mutual co-operation in the great and highly important things upon which they were agreed: and seeing we were unshaken in our belief of the matters in dispute as at the beginning, and consequently no nearer agreed than when we began, that it would conduce to the harmony and good feeling of all, if the debate were discontinued. Accordingly we were requested to close the discussion that evening. We consented, and agreed, that on the re-assembling of the audience, I should address them on some general topic as long as I thought proper, and afterwards brother C. should do the same. I then read 1 John v. and brother C. the 4th and 5th chapters of the Apocalypse, from which we spoke some hour or so apiece, and then dismissed.

During the recess, and after we agreed to close, brother Campbell inquired of me through certain brethren, what I had to propose, by which our difficulties might be settled. In reply, I observed, that I had already made proposals by letter to brother C., but that as they appeared to have failed, I was willing to leave it to the brethren to say *what we ought to do,* at the same time reserving to ourselves the right of accepting, rejecting, or modifying the proposals as we should think fit. They thought this was "noble," and that nothing could be fairer. It was submitted to brother C., who forthwith gave it his assent

In pursuance of these things the brethren met, and entered upon the discussion of the matter. After much debating, which consumed

about five hours, the brethren, whose names are subscribed, at last came to an understanding as to what should be proposed to me, and that upon my accepting their proposition, brother C. ought to give in his adhesion. It had been urged that 'certain things in relation to" man's mortality, resurrection, and punishment, taught by me, were calculated to weaken the restraints of the Christian religion, and to excite prejudices in the minds of some against our views in general; and that, consequently, I ought to be requested to forego their formal discussion; especially, as I admitted, that their truth or otherwise did not affect the faith or hope of the Christian. These "certain things" deemed so obnoxious, inexpedient, and dangerous in their tendency, are well known by all to consist of the non-resurrection of infants, idiots, and a portion of the Pagan world, termed by me "the third class;" and of the absolute destruction in hell, in the strictest sense, of the unjust, who shall be raised to suffer the punishment of the second death. These "certain things," which flow from the unqualified mortality of man, I have taught, discussed, and do still most assuredly believe; nevertheless, I do not believe that the belief of these items of the truth affects either the destiny of the third class or of those who believe them: and as I have hitherto discussed them, I think, unless stimulated thereto by others, my brethren at that meeting concluded that there would be no difficulty in obtaining my consent to hold them in abeyance for peace sake. Besides, it had been represented that there would be a division predicated upon the propagation of these "certain things." But who, having a right understanding of the spirit and genius of the New Institution, would dream, much less plot the disseverance and alienation of the disciples of the "one Lord," upon a question as to the final destiny of an idiot, or of the unqualified destruction of "the destroyed!" Such a thought never entered my head, nor should any thing short of a surrender of principle be too great a sacrifice to prevent so "untoward an event." This sentiment I had over and over again expressed to the major part of the brethren, who composed the meeting on Thursday night; if unfortunately division be forced upon us by any, let that separation be for principle, and not for unimportant details.

These things, then, being so, brother William Stone, of Lunenburg county, embodied them in the resolution subjoined; which, upon some further discussion, was passed unanimously.

"We, the undersigned brethren, in free consultation met at the house of brother John Tinsley Jeter, at Paineville; and after frankly comparing our views, unanimously agreed upon the resolution subjoined, and submitted the same for the consideration of brethren Campbell and Thomas; and brother Thomas agreeing to abide the same, all difficulties were adjusted, and perfect harmony and co-operation mutually agreed upon between them.

"*Resolved*, That whereas certain things believed and propagated by Dr. Thomas, in relation to the mortality of man, the resurrection of the dead, and the final destiny of the wicked, having given offence to many brethren, and being likely to produce a division amongst us; and believing the said views to be of no *practical* benefit, we recommend to brother Thomas to discontinue the discussion of the same, *unless in his defence when misrepresented.*

PAINEVILLE, Amelia, Va. Nov. 15th, 1838.

Signed by—Wm. A. Stone, Thomas E. Jeter, R. H. Degernette, Thomas Arvin, James M. Jeter, John T. Jeter, Langston Arvin, R. L. Coleman, Thomas J. Horner, James A. Watson, H. G. Hardy, James F. Price, William Arvin, Jr., James W. Poindexter, James W. Goss, James W. Wootton, Charles Man, James Chappel, J. C. Booker, Jesse Smith, Samuel S. Henley, Cephas Shelburn, Silas Shelburn."

The resolution being agreed upon by the brethren, brother C., and myself were requested to appear before them. The result of their deliberations was reported to us; we acquiesced in the recommendation after a few words of mutual explagation; and having recognized our Christian fraternity, the brethren gave in their names to brother Stone to be appended in the order affixed.

Thus has been happily composed, and, I trust, extinguished forever, the misunderstanding which has so long subsisted between us. The foregoing resolution was put into my hands at the request of brother C. that I might insert it in The Advocate, with what remarks I might think fit, and he would copy them into The Harbinger. With this suggestion I have complied; having been careful to avoid any allusion calculated to ruffle the equal current of our minds. That I might the more certainly accomplish so desirable a consummation, I have deferred their inscription until this date; that I might avail myself of the reminiscences of those brethren in Lunenburg, as well as in Amelia, who composed the bulk of the meeting. I have written these remarks at brother Wm. Stone's, who drew up the resolution and presided on the occasion; and I have requested him to say whether the account I have given embodies the sentiments and views designed to be presented in the resolution.

JOHN THOMAS.

December 17th, 1838.

Brother Thomas having requested me to say whether the foregoing narrative embodies the sentiments and views designed to be set forth in the resolution drawn up by me, I observe, that I have carefully read over his account, and have no hesitation in saying that that section of it which refers to our proceedings at brother Tinsley Jeter's is correct, and does accurately set forth the sentiments and vrews designed to be expressed in the document referred to.

WM. A. STONE.

December 17th, 1838.

Discussion of Universalism.

MR. SKINNER TO MR. CAMPBELL

No. XXXVII.

New York, November 10, 1838.

Dear Sir—Your 34th letter, dated nearly three weeks after my 33d was mailed for you, and mailed to me nearly three weeks after its date, reached me in ten days after it was mailed, making nearly eight weeks for me to get an answer, after you had agreed to "furnish me with a letter in manuscript by each mail," so that the discussion could be all written out before I should leave for the South! Your 36th letter, which you knew I must have before I could answer it, reached me in this city, *via* Utica, (from whence it was forwarded immediately on its reception there,) to-day, the 19th inst. You seem fully determined to prevent the possibility of closing the discussion the present year, be

cause, forsooth, it would oblige me! I shall now proceed to answer these long delayed letters, 34 and 36.

2. In order to lay before our readers the connected and uninterrupted arguments in favor of my fourth proposition, I informed you, letter 25, that I should proceed with that object for two or three letters before replying to aught you might say. I fulfilled that pledge, and you now accuse me, letter 31, paragraph 1, of doing it in order to throw myself so much in the rear as to screen my imbecility from the view of the reader! You had once before accused me of not daring to publish a single letter from you without accompanying it *in the same paper* with my reply? Most admirable consistency!! Need I reply to such grumbling puerility? This letter answers all you have yet written, however far you thought to have outstripped me.

3. You next accuse me of denying the history of satan as given in the Bible. The charge is utterly truthless. I devoutly believe in all the Bible says of satan, devil, &c. I only reject your wild and baseless chimeras about satan, founded only in Heathenism, tradition, and the perversion of a few metaphorical expressions of scripture. You charge me with scepticism and infidelity, and class me with known and avowed infidels. Sir, Paine, Hume, and Voltaire were Deists, if I mistake not, though I am not as familiar with them as you appear to be. They believed in a God—you believe in the same; therefore you are a Deist by the same rule by which you condemn me! An Atheist believes Martin Van Buren the most suitable person for the office of U. S. President; or, he believes Henry Clay or Daniel Webster would be more suitable; you agree with him on this subject, therefore you are an Atheist! Fie, fie, friend Campbell, on such reasoning! Because an infidel is wrong in rejecting the gospel, can he therefore hold no truth? —believe in nothing reasonable?

4. Sir, so far from being driven by you, as you seem to imagine, to avow my present opinion of satan, the devil and his angels, &c., I published my views thereon more than eight years ago, in a series of letters to Rev. S. C. Aikin. A second edition of that work was published in 1833, and at least 6000 copies of those letters have been circulated in the United States. To that work I refer you and our readers, both for a refutation of your present charge, and a more full exhibition of my views than I can here give. The word satan signifies *opponent*. We read Num. xxii. 22. "The angel of the Lord stood in the way for an adversary (*a satan*, in Hebrew) against him," [Balaam,] Here it seems was one good satan, not a bad one, nor a fallen angel. The word *devil* [Greek *diabolos*] signifies a *slanderer*, an *enemy*. It is often applied to individual men, and even to women, (see it applied to the deacons' wives, 1 Tim. iii. 11,) sometimes to communities or bodies of men, (as to the Jews, who slandered and persecuted the disciples,) and sometimes it personifies lust, or the principle of evil. Peter was called a *satan*, and Judas was called a *devil*. The words *daimon* and *daimonion*, translated *devil*, signify *lunacy*, *epilepsy*, or some other mental or bodily disease, once applied to dumbness. See Matth. xviii. 15.: Luke xi. 14. These kinds of devils of antiquity resembled the witchcraft of Salem, Mass., in the days of Cotton Mather, and had just as much personality about them and no more. Both kinds of devils were spoken of in Palestine among the Jews, just as the people of Massachusetts spoke of witches, wizzards, and witchcraft, when they

were in vogue. And had any one the rashness to avow his disbelief that these supposed witches and wizzards were really under the influence of some personal devil at that time, his temerity would probably have cost him his life.

5. But, sir, I avow it as my solemn, deliberate and conscientious opinion, that the Bible contains no evidence of the real personal existence of a being called the *devil*, any more than it does of a real personal being called *Wisdom*, which is personified by Solomon, and represented as a female, a lady, "uttering her voide in the streets—crying in the openings of the gates," &c. Where, sir, is your evidence of the personal existence of such a being, or if he exist, that he was once an angel of purity in heaven? You have none but tradition.

6. In answer to your 4th paragraph, I again repeat, that Solomon said nothing about *the world of spirits* in Eccl. ix. 10. If he did, and is to be believed, the world of spirits is a state of *unconsciousness*, and can neither be happy nor miserable. The word *hades* here simply means the grave, and has no bearing on the future existence or condition of spirits. You say, paragraph 5, I "have annihilated satan to get rid of hell," and "made foolish the death of Christ, to obviate both punishment and pardon!" Another false charge: for I believe in all the satans and hells, and just such ones as the Bible speaks of; and you knew I believed both in punishment and pardon, while you do not, but are obliged to reject one to make room for the other. Your perverseness is truly astonishing. In your very next paragraph, you say, my "hope of heaven" is founded on the belief that there "is no satan, no devil, no hell!" Sir, suppose there were none—would this prove the *existence of a heaven?* You know it would not; and you knew you were perversely wicked when you penned the charge. You next introduce a common *infidel pun* to get rid of meeting the strength of Calvinistic and Arminian Universalism. What a faithful disciple, and what a brave soldier!

7. Your 11th, 12th, and 13th paragraphs are too obvious and ridiculous a caricature to deserve any notice, excepting the sentence in which you state that the object of your 28th letter was "to show that the ultimate destiny of the wicked shall not be as the righteous." If such was your object, you wholly failed in your proof; for not one of the passages you quoted says one syllable about the *ultimate destiny* of the wicked. You are too prone to apply temporary judgments to express the *ultimate* destiny of their subjects. I have proved the ultimate destiny of all men to be salvation through Christ Jesus the Saviour of the world. I have never, as you accuse me, quoted the Apocrypha in proof of my sentiments, and but one text in illustration; while you have not only resorted to the Apocrypha, but even to the Targums. You say, "Remember, Mr. Skinner, that we all die because our father stole an apple." I remember, sir, that the Bible says no such thing. Read Luke xii. 47, 48. and blot out your 14th paragraph forever!

8. The much talked of "Universalist dogma," often commented on by you, and quoted by me, letter 13, paragraph 7, fully refutes your 15th paragraph, and shews it to be a mere caricature. Your 16th, 17th, and 18th are of the same perverse character. It is useless to repel and disclaim, again, and again, and yet again, the scores of false charges you bring against me. If you wish to continue the game of caricature and rdicule, I might inform you that two can play at it as well as one; and

your own weapons could be turned against you with tenfold power. But I despise that game that only excites for it the regret of sober minds and the contempt and ridicule of infidels. Indeed, sir, the *bona fide* features of your system are altogether more abhorrent than the misshapen caricature of mine, which you play upon. For at the very worst, mine only embraces a limited, temporary and remedial evil, resulting in universal good, while yours embraces an *illimitable and endless evil*, resulting in no possible good, and that too, *foreordained in the eternal counsels of God!* Suppose by caricature and sarcasm, you could make me or any private opinion of mine, entirely unconnected with either of our propositions, appear ever so ridiculous, would that refute *my yet unanswered arguments*, or help you out of the strong ramparts of Universalism with which *you are completely environed?* Have you the presumption to believe that you or I can save immortal souls from endless wo, and give them endless bliss? What folly! You or I may by our influence, affect the temporary characters and well-being of our fellow-men; but I rejoice in believing their eternal destinies are in safer hands.

9. The Apostle says, and I say, and you repeat, that "perfect love casts out tormenting fear." It is obvious too, that *tormenting fear never produces perfect love.* Why, then, leave perfect love untouched, untold, and seek to reform men by tormenting fear alone? I urge all the motives of fear that the Bible does. My system, sir, presents as much stronger restraints against vice, in the *certain* punishments it holds up against every sin, and as much purer motives to virtue, in the lovely character of God, and the endless purity and beatitude it holds up, than yours does, as heaven is purer and better than hell. The grace of God manifested in Christ, in which I devoutly believe, has converted thousands from Belial to Christ—from sin to holiness—from vice to virtue. But where are the converts made by the preaching of endless wo—your *hell-fire* converts? Answer, they are either hypocritical pretenders that fear hell, not love God, or else are driven to open infidelity and the abhorrence of the very name of religion.

To your 9th and 10th paragraphs I can reply in few words. Paul says, "Jesus expiated or purged away our sins:" Mr. Campbell says, sin shall never be expiated or purged away. John says, "We love him because he first loved us:" Mr. Campbell says, We love him for fear he will hate us if we don't. David says, "Unto thee, O Lord, belongeth mercy; for thou renderest to every man according to his work:" Mr. Campbell says, If God render to all according to their works, he cannot exercise any mercy towards them. Paul says, "He that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done, and there is no respect of persons." Mr. Campbell says, There is great respect of persons; for some shall receive, and others shall not receive according to the wrong they have done, so as to make room for the pardon of a few. Paul says, "How shall we escape [from the coming calamities of Jerusalem] if we neglect so great salvation?" Mr. Campbell says, How shall we escape [from an endless hell] if we neglect so little salvation? Christ says, "The night cometh," &c. Mr. Campbell says, *Death and hades* cometh. Christ says, "They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick." Mr. Campbell thinks the heavenly Physician will cure the whole only, and make the sick still sicker. He thinks he has but one kind of medicine, and can-

not vary his prescriptions to suit different cases—that it would be monstrous absurdity to think sweet medicines could cure one patient, and bitter another, or that judgments and mercies could alike be made efficacious by the Divine Physician.

11, You fill nearly two pages with L. C. Todd's second renunciation of Universalism in 1833, (for recollect he had *once before* renounced the doctrine.) You consider it a triumphant argument against Universalism. You say he is good authority. Sir, did you ever know a traitor speak well of the company he abandoned? You say that I "most shamefully abused him because of his honesty." Sir, I appeal to the whole world, including Mr. T. himself, when I affirm that I *never* abused him, either for his honesty or any thing else. I published the whole of his renunciation in my paper of August 10, 1833, accompanied with some mild strictures and remarks, breathing altogether a kinder spirit than either of your letters to me has for months past. That was the only article I ever wrote about him. To that I appeal. God knows I never had an unkind feeling towards, or wish to injure him. But if he is good authority against us, then all who have renounced your doctrine and embraced Universalism, are equally good against you. L. C Todd's venerable and worthy father was once a Baptist preacher, like yourself; but he renounced the barbarous notion of endless damnation, and embraced the doctrine of universal salvation, and will now testify as unfavorably against your doctrine, as his recreant son does against ours. Moreover, we have at least *ten* converts from your doctrine where you have *one* from ours, and by your own rule, we have *ten times* as much evidence against you as you have against us.

12. If I am rightly informed, Mr. Todd as deeply regrets his renunciation of Universalism, and the course he pursued in that matter, as a man can do—he has stopped preaching, abandoned the Methodists, and it is believed that nothing but pride and mortification prevents him from returning to us. If you wish for any more articles of a like character, I suppose I can furnish you with one or two more Universalist renunciations, to enable you to fill out your other two letters

13. I now hasten to notice your letter No. 36. It is made up of vain efforts to garnish a desperate cause in its last struggles for existence, to reiterate threadbare gasconade and caricature, and to evade arguments which you are now obviously convinced you cannot refute. It reminds one of the croaking of frogs when afflicted with cold, of the grating sounds of a musical instrument sadly out of tune, of the faint and evanescent glimmerings of expiring embers. Your first four paragraphs give a wretched analysis of my 35th letter, without an effort to refute it. But, truly, it is news to me that my rule for explaining the phrases, *all, all men*, &c. is also your own rule! Let this fact be remembered, and let the reader just turn to letter 35, paragraph 5, and see what doctrine is there proved.

14. I neither stultify Adam Clarke nor quote him on the Apocalypse with less approbation than on other books. Will you tell your readers in what paragraph I have said, "All sorrow, crying and tears have ceased ages before we were born"?—You say you argue "that such words as *elect, saved, condemned*, &c. always imply another class of men who are not approved, justified, saved, &c." Well, do you argue that none but those called "*the elect*" will ever be saved?—that when God says he will have "*all men* to be *saved*," it is *implied* he will have

another class to be *damned?*—that when Paul says, "the free gift came upon *all men unto justification of life*," it is *implied* that another class should receive *condemnation to endless misery?*

15. You call it a "calumny" to mention Destructionists as your brethren! Take care, or your brothers Thomas and Shepard will be in your hair. You say Destructionism "is indeed less revolting to sinners [should you not have added, *to saints and all good beings?*] than endless misery." You say my 13th paragraph is "a beggarly account of empty boxes." Most true! I handed you the box and asked you to contribute a reason for the well known fact that the early Fathers, who were well known advocates of universal restoration, spoke, notwithstanding, frequently of *ever* [*age*] *lasting punishment.* You return the box empty—and can give no reason!! I have replied to all your letters and more than all your arguments.

16. You decline, as I expected, giving your own Notes from the Family Testament, to your readers. *You dare not do it!* You know they refute your positions in this discussion. Hundreds of your readers have never seen them. They will, they *must know your motives.* What a predicament! Your 6th paragraph is a lament because you could not prevail on me to acknowledge all your caricatures to be true representations of my sentiments. Still, you half repeat, though with a faint heart, in this and your 10th paragraphs, the same miserable caricatures. Your 7th paragraph is another vain effort to maintain the old serpent's doctrine, that God will *not* "render to every man according to his work," and to set aside the Psalmist's doctrine, that he *will.* Psalm xviii. 25, 26., so far from explaining away Psalm lxii. 12., is but a confirmation of it, and another refutation of the doctrine of the deceiver. On both of them I remark, that if God "render to every man according to his work," and your doctrine be true that every sin deserves endless damnation, then universal endless damnation must be the portion of our race! Again, God says, Amos iii. 1, 2., "Hear this word that the Lord hath spoken against you, O children of Israel, against the *whole family* which I brought up from the land of Egypt, saying, you only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore, *I will punish you for all your iniquities.*" Of course, if your notion of the deserts of sin be true, not a soul of the children of Israel down to the days of Amos, can escape an endless hell!

17. You still talk, paragraphs 7, 8, 18, 19, of justice and mercy, as though they were jarring and discordant attributes in the divine character, and as though, to maintain the justice of God, I am obliged to deny his mercy and the doctrine of pardon and the forgiveness of sin; whereas, I as fully believe in the latter as you can, and am not, like you, obliged to deny the former. See Letter 25, and Letter 35, paragraph 23. God "is a just God and a Saviour." He both punishes and forgives sin in the same individuals. See Ps. xcix. 8; lxii. 12. His ways and thoughts are as far above ours, as the heavens are above the earth. If you can find a single text that speaks of God's forgiving the *punishment* of sin, why do you not adduce it! There is none. You will have punishment exclude forgiveness, justice annihilate mercy, penitentiaries to confine criminals after sin is finished and an end made of transgression, and gibbets to hang folks on after there shall cease to be any murderers! Your little hypercriticism on the accidental omission of a letter in writing or printing *aphiemi*, is greatly to your credit!

18. The six texts referred to in my last, and quoted in previous letters, on four of which you profess to comment, paragraphs 14--17, are no stronger in favor of Universalism than scores of others quoted in letters 23, 25, 27, and 29, which, with my comments thereon, yet remain unanswered. Your comments on these four are but a *ruse de guerre*, which will prove wholly unavailing to your cause. Look at the plain language and obvious meaning of Psalm xxii. 27—"All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord, and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee." This language implies, first, every individual of the human family, unless you can find some one who is neither of *any nation*, nor a *kindred* or *relative* of any nation; and if you can find any such, you may have them eternally damned, if you please! Second, That, as yet, they had not remembered or turned unto the Lord and worshipped before him. Third, That all certainly should do it. Fourth, That remembering, turning to the Lord and worshipping before him, is equivalent to hearty reconciliation to him, and consequently implies salvation. And, fifth, The next verse assigns the reason for all this, viz.—"For the kingdom is the LORD'S, and *he is the Governor among the nations*."

19. On Psalm cxiv. 9. I ask, If God knew that any soul would be endlessly miserable when he gave it existence, was he *good* in giving an existence which he knew and intended should prove an endless curse? If this is *goodness*, what would he *evil*? If this is *benevolence*, what would be *malevolence*? How is God *good* to those he intends to make endlessly miserable? If not endlessly miserable, (as they cannot be if this text be true,) they will be ultimately happy: for we both reject annihilation. If God be now good to all, he eternally will be. Isaiah xliv. 22-24. not only asserts, on the oath of God, that every knee shall bow and every tongue swear, but tells us *what* they shall swear, viz. that *in the Lord they have righteousness and strength*, and this, sir, is sufficient salvation for me. Paul not only reiterates the sentiment that every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father, but also assures us that no man can make this confession but by the Holy Ghost; consequently, the divine spirit must then dwell and operate in the heart. See Philip. ii. 10, 11; 1 Cor. xii. 3.

20. 1 Cor. xv. proves something more than the mere resurrection of all men. It proves the manner and character of the resurrection and its subjects—that they shall be raised in *incorruption, glory, power, with spiritual and celestial bodies, which can die no more*—that *death, the last enemy, shall be destroyed*, the reconciled kingdom delivered up to God the Father, and *God shall be all in all*. See the whole chapter. Paul not only teaches these great truths here, and that all shall be made alive in Christ, but in 2 Cor. v. 17 he says, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold all things are become new." Thus, sir, the more these texts are examined, the more clearly are they seen to teach the salvation of all men. You suppose, paragraph 18, because God sometimes superadds outward calamities to mental anguish and remorse of conscience, as a punishment for sin, that therefore the latter are no punishment at all! Was the remorse of David, of Joseph's brethren, of the Prodigal, of Judas for betraying Christ, and of Peter for denying him, *no punishment*? What a theologian! The last part of your 18th paragraph is evidently better calculated to serve the cause of *Destructionism* than endless misery. To make Romans vi. 23. subserve *your* cause, it must read, "The wages of sin is endless damnation, and the gift of God is *not* eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." I prefer the Apostle's reading to yours.

21. I will now present our readers with a few of the sublime beauties and glories of your system. You first people your heaven of immortal purity and glory, with a race of ambitious, sinful, and rebellious angels, who, growing tired of such a paradise and such a government, mutiny against their sovereign King, raise a rebellion, where no discord or sin can ever exist, and after a long and bloodless fight, (because the combatants are immortal,) are hurled from heaven's high battlements, down to the shades of endless darkness and despair, and bound in chains of adamantine wo and endless pain. To console himself for this loss in heaven, your Divinity next creates an earthly paradise, and peoples it with human beings, all innocent and pure; but lest they should remain so, he places an apple-tree loaded with inviting fruit, before them, and inhibits their partaking thereof, although he knew they would disobey, and the consequence be infinite wo. He next unchains his demons of darkness, whilom his companions in glory, (or else they have escape I without his knowledge or consent,) to make sure of the ruin of man, who succeed in seducing the first human pair from purity and bliss.

22. Your Divinity next gets mad at Adam and Eve, for doing just what he knew, and ordained, and provided means, that they should do, and pronounces the malediction of endless damnation on them and all their innocent, unborn, and unoffending offspring, down to the latest posterity. He, however, soon began to relent somewhat of the severity of this dreadful malediction, and although he had unequivocally threatened it, and the chief fallen fiend had told Eve it would never be inflicted, he concluded to verify Satan's words and falsify his own! So he set about a plan with the least possible *appearance* of falsifying his word. He pretended that his justice was wronged, and he must either inflict the threatened penalty on man, or on some substitute; so he shapes himself over into a human form, calls himself his own son, and is the Father of himself! Then he *inflicts* the whole weight of his own almighty wrath upon the head of his *innocent son*, and lets the *rebel sinner go unpunished*, and this is his *justice!* Nay, not exactly so—he inflicts the penalty on himself! for the Son was but himself under a different name!! His justice cannot relinquish one iota of the infinite debt recorded against the sinner man, and so he himself pays the debt to himself, which himself demands!! And after all, the debt is

not paid, nor is justice any more satisfied than before; the whole of this bloody exhibition of infinite wrath, cruelty, and injustice, is but a tragic pageant—the ill fated rebel still owes the infinite debt—not one iota of it has been cancelled—infinite wrath still hangs over his head, and endless wo still awaits him!!

"Far in the deep where darkness dwells,
The land of horror and despair,
Justice has built a dismal hell,
And laid her stores of vengeance there!
Eternal plagues and heavy chains,
Tormenting racks and fiery coals,
And darts t'inflict immortal pains,
Dipt in the blood of damned souls."

23. Your Divinity is so well pleased with rebellion, that though he has the power, he determines never to put a period to it, but to prolong it to all eternity! He likes sin so well, that he resolves it shall never cease, but be perpetuated as long as he himself shall exist. He sets his jarring attributes at war with each other. His justice, which with you is synonymous with revenge, would fain consign the whole human family to endless damnation; his mercy, which with you has no regard to the claims of justice, would fain send them all to heaven. He, therefore, like the false mother under Solomon, calls for the sword to divide the living child, (the human family,) and send one part to heaven to laugh and shoutingly exult there over the other part, no more sinful than themselves, while howling in the endless torments of hell! As you doubtless expect you shall be one of the laughing company, and as you say a majority of mankind that hear your gospel reject it, and thereby enhance their endless wretchedness, this accounts for your zeal in propagating your gospel, so as to get as many to hell as possible, over whom you expect to exult to all eternity! You send the little child of three years old, which has never committed but one fault in all its life, and that a venial one, to an endless hell, to wail in hopeless and irremediable anguish forever; and exalt the grey-headed sinner of four-score years, whose long life of the flagrant crimes of theft, robbery, arson, and murder, has been wholly devoted to crime, to an endless heaven, without any punishment here or hereafter, if he repents ten minutes before he dies!

24. Although you say that for aught that appears in your premises, nine-tenths of human kind may be saved, yet you say a majority of the world, as yet, have died unbelievers—yea, that a majority of those who have heard the gospel have rejected it; and we know that but a very small portion of mankind have ever heard it at all. Therefore your construction of the text, "He that believeth not shall be damned," compels you to send *all infants*, from the first to the last of Adam's race, to an endless hell; for not one of them either has, or could believe, in this life. All idiots must share the same fate for the same reason. The whole Heathen world must go the same road: all Mahommedans, and all Jews, (except the very few believers in Christianity,) all infidels, and a majority of those who live in Christian lands—nearly or quite all Papists—in short, all but the few who believe in your own orthodoxy, and are baptized in your mode, including at least nine hundred and ninety-nine thousand out of every million of the human family, from the morning of time to the present moment, must sink down in billows of almighty wrath, and wail and shriek in hopeless despair, while ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands of years and of ages shall slowly, s-l-o-w-l-y roll away, and still their sufferings will be but just *beginning to begin! Eternity*, ETERNITY, E-T-E-R-N-I-T-Y of misery is still before them!! And all this inconceivable misery and anguish is—for what? *Cui bono?* Why, for nothing in creation but to glut the vindictive wrath and satiate the merciless cruelty of an almighty tyrant, and to please the few choice spirits in your almost empty heaven, and give them supreme felicity in beholding the endless rebellion and ceaseless woes of their fellow beings whom they are required to love as themselves! O, my God! what a theory is this! and what a heart and head must that man have, who, like you, can swallow down the whole!! Why, sir, Mahommedanism, or Heathenism itself, is beauty and consistency, when compared with those parts of your system above exhibited. But I forbear—though I might fill many pages with such revolting but true descriptions of your doctrine—in mercy to you and your friends I forbear, and hope the lesson will not be lost upon you.

Faithfully yours,

D. SKINNER.

Mr. Campbell to Mr. Skinner.

No. XXXVIII.

GREENVILLE, S. C., December 24, 1838.

Mr. Skinner,

Sir—Yours of the 19th ult. found me here on the 22d instant. I had not leisure to examine it till this morning. It is, if possible,

still more perfect in its kind than any of its predecessors. Nothing but the solemnity of a covenant to publish twenty letters from you, on condition of your publishing twenty letters from me on the merits of Universalism, could have induced me to pollute so much paper with such a tissue of misrepresentation, falsehood, vulgarity, and abuse. Your letters are a disgrace to the religious controversy of the age. True, indeed, independent of my agreement to discuss this question with you, (on a fallacious representation of your character, however,) I think your language and style afford a peculiar occasion for the display of Christian meekness and patience on the part of any lover of truth, who would undertake or condescend to debate with you on any religious question. The vials of your indignation, already drained out, and the frenzied ebullitions of the exasperated demon of Universalism, do, indeed, abundantly prove how deeply the arrows of truth have penetrated the champion of *benevolent Restorationism*, insomuch that his creed and his spirit form one of the strongest contrasts in nature, and mutually divorced, are in opposite directions seeking the antagonist extremes of the universe.

2—Much of your present communication is beneath criticism. Wholly destitute of argument, it affords nothing for reason or logic to do. It is an offering most acceptable to the broken and disheartened spirit of a mortified party, that prefers absolute scepticism to everlasting punishment: for any thing is preferable to "the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels," to the man destitute of a well-grounded hope of heaven.

3—You seem duly aware of the fact, that your brethren, both the preachers and the proselytes, need all the unction and wine of *no-hellism* to animate their hopes of heaven; and, therefore, I presume it is that you so faithfully labor for their consolation. But, sir, why can you not do this without so constantly and so artfully misrepresenting me? Your first paragraph represents me as violating an agreement to "furnish you with a letter in manuscript each mail" to hasten the termination of the discussion, and as unnecessarily delaying my letters, as if "determined to prevent the closing of the discussion the present year, because, forsooth, it would oblige you." Now, sir, did you not know when you wrote this, that you yourself were the cause of all this delay!—that you made it impossible to finish the controversy this year, or for me to write out my replies as you proposed! Yes, sir, you *did* know it: you wrote me a slip in your paper of October, stating that you, being absent from Utica, had delayed some three weeks in furnishing the first manuscript letter; and Mr. William Arny, of my office, informed you, under date of October 31st, that several copies of my letter No. 34 had been mailed to you *four weeks* before that date, and that your manuscript, No. 35, came to hand only on the eve of my departure to the South, and that I had taken it with me to answer it on the first opportunity which occurred. Again—Mr. Arny, on the 20th of August, in reply to your note of the 3d of that month, by my request, urged you to hasten your letters; and on the 19th September wrote you again, stating that *a month had transpired* since your proposal to furnish a letter per each return mail from me, without a single word from you! Now, sir, with all these facts before you, how could you fabricate such a paragraph as your No. 1? Such morality requires such divinity as you preach!!

4—As this is all the original or new matter in your present epistle, I might here lay down my pen or proceed to my closing epistle; but, for the sake of some new readers, I shall make one or two additional notices. Counting one by one, I have found one hundred and seven assertions in the single communication before me, a majority of which are grossly false, and the balance gratuitous or wholly irrelevant. The whole of these, multiplied by 10, would not prove any tenet, nor disprove any proposition in the world. You admit and deny, and then deny and admit the same things under different forms of speech—and sometimes almost the same forms. You believe in a Devil or Satan; but then it is a good angel, a Peter, or a deacon's wife. You believe in a *daimon* or a *daimonion;* but then it is lunacy or epilepsy. You believe in many devils; but then they are the witches of old Salem in Massachusetts. And as for *ho Satanas, the* Satan, *the* Devil, he is a phantom, and his fall is an old wife's fable!

5—One of your brother Editors of the West says the miracles of Christ were not supernatural, and are only splendid metaphors, (liss I trow;) and with you, his good brother, the devil and his angels, their fall and expulsion from heaven—the temptation and fall of Adam and Eve—and the incarnation of THE WORD, and his death for our sins, &c. &c. are all old wives' fables!! Your devil is a personification of vice—an impersonal phantom—a part of human nature. Your devils or demons are lunacy and epilepsy. Mary, of Magdala, had seven epilepsies in her at one time; and Jesus dispossessed a legion of lunacies out of an unfortunate epileptic; and they possessed a herd of swine, which, becoming lunatic, ran into the sea. Your devils, the witches, "believe and tremble;" and, speaking to Jesus, said, "Art thou come hither to torment us before the time?" What splendid mysteries and miracles possess the soul of a benevolent Restorationist!

6—Well, as "the Bible possesses no evidence of the real personal existence of a being called the Devil," we must suppose that Jesus was tempted by his own lusts; that a lunacy entered Judas when he sold his Master: and that the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels, was prepared for Cotton Mather and his Salem witches!

7—You quoted the Apocrypha twice! I did not quote the Targums once in this controversy. We all die because Eve eat the forbidden fruit, apple or fig, I do assert from the Bible; and although you do not believe it, Moses and the Apostle Paul did. You say that you cannot affect the eternal destinies of man by your preaching. You are not, then, of Paul's party, who were the savor of life or of death to their hearers!

8—"Where are the converts," you say, "made by the preaching of eternal woe—your hell-fire converts! They are hypocritical pretenders," you answer. You have, in almost every letter, raged, laughed, and scouted at the "hell-fire. damnation, everlasting punishment, and eternal fire preachers." Now as I am not remarkable for this sort of preaching, I may be allowed to say for this proscribed class, that they justify themselves by saying that Jesus the Saviour is their model; for he first introduced this style. He said, "None but he that doeth the will of his Father should enter the kingdom of heaven." "In that day I will say, *depart from me, ye workers of iniquity,*" to those who prophesied in his name, but did not do what he commanded them. "Unless

your righteousness excel the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees you will never enter the kingdom of heaven." "Fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." "It will be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for him who will not hear (or obey) the words" of the Apostles. "It is profitable for thee that one of thy members perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell"—"cast into hell." "Serpents! generation of vipers! how can you escape the damnation of hell!" "Better for thee to enter into life maimed, than, having two hands, to go into hell, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched—where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched,—where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched"—having two eyes to be cast into hell, where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. Thus, four times in one speech, spoke the benevolent Messiah. "He that believeth not shall be damned." "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels." Truly, was he not a hell-fire preacher! and is he not, in this, good authority for those who regard him as the great philanthropist! Mr. Skinner and his *laughing* brotherhood had better take care that they be not found ridiculing the Judge of the human race!

9—But you can settle all these points in a very easy manner. Jesus used metaphors, was tempted of the devil, and did not understand hell-fire so well as Mr. Skinner and his brethren. "How shall we escape from the coming calamities of the Jews *if* we neglect so great salvation!" Your system, you say, "presents stronger restraints from vice, and purer motives to virtue, than mine." It has, then, got a most hardened set of sinners to operate on: for of all professors of Christianity under the heavens, it does the least to reform its converts. None need more reformation than your brethren. Mr. Todd is only one of a hundred *traitors!* (for all who join the Universalists are *traitors* to the parties they leave, according to your logic,) who concur in saying that "*no man was ever made better by joining the Universalists—a thousand are made worse, but none better.*"

10—I am personally acquainted with some four or five Universalian preachers who have joined the church of Christ, of which I am a member, who all say that Mr. Todd speaks their experience, or who all concur with him in opinion. I do not believe one word of what you now say of Mr. Todd. I have evidence to the contrary. Will you name only one person in America that has grown better by joining your church, and send me the testimony of any minister or magistrate not of your church, in proof of the fact, and I will publish him as a moral miracle to all my readers? I opine you cannot do it. Do try. As you have got *ten* converts from our doctrine for *one* we have from yours, it will be easy to find one, if one there be. But I opine you do not glory much in the moral stamina of these leprous converts.

11—You pervert Paul's remark. He says, "By one offence sentence came upon all men *to* condemnation," or to temporal death; "so by one righteousness sentence came upon all men to justification of life," or to a respite of natural life. It is natural life and death, as connected with the two Adams, and not eternal life and death.

12—To "forgive punishment" is nonsense. You ask for such a phrase in the Bible. The Bible always speaks good sense. When

sin or a debt is forgiven, the pain or penalty ceases as a matter of course. Remorse, you say, is the punishment of sin—the sure punishment. What philosophy! The greatest sinners have the least remorse—that is, the greatest sinners suffer the least punishment!

13—Your proof-texts are fairly abandoned on the ground of my challenge. You do not attempt an exegetical or common sense development of any one of them. You repeal your former gloss. But will any man of common sense call this an acceptance of my challenge? You have not shown, indeed you cannot show, that the ultimate holiness and happiness of all mankind is intimated in any one verse of the Bible. You have prudently declined it.

14—Your 21st and 22d paragraphs are only surpassed by Abner Kneeland, Taylor, and Carlile, of atheistic and blasphemous memory. I never read any thing so grossly profane from any professor of religion. Your present of the sublime beauties of my system, is slander of the first degree. You pervert my views and remarks on the relative numbers of the saved and lost. I never thought nor taught such dogmas as you allege. My *opinion* is, that all infants and children, who have never transgressed a positive law, are saved through the death of Christ; and I always read the commission thus: He that *hears* the gospel, *believes* it, and is *baptized*, shall be saved; and he that *hears* the gospel, and *rejects* it, shall be damned. You, therefore, misrepresent both my opinions and faith on this subject, and finish with a sublime exaggeration of the whole matter. Why did you not print eternity with one letter on every column? You had better ask the impenitent, with such a dread eternity before them, "Of how much sorer punishment than death, will they be thought worthy" who despise the gospel salvation, instead of teaching them to despise the word of Christ.

15—Your own system of the existence of moral evil, remorse, pain, punishment, and purgatory, as I have unanswerably shown, is just as clear and positive a reproach upon the goodness, justice, and mercy of the Creator, on your own premises, as the everlasting punishment of the wicked. If God can, for certain reasons, originate and continue for thousands of years, such a mixed system of good and evil, of happiness and misery, there is no man of sense or reason can say, that for certain reasons he may not continue it for ever. Justice and injustice are not questions of *quantity*, but of *quality*. "He that is unjust in little," says Jesus, "is unjust in much." Now if God can justly and benevolently permit so much misery in the angelic, human, and brutal creations for so many ages, for transcendant reasons he may continue it for ever. Here reason must be silent, and revelation alone can speak. The Bible deposes that for one offence of one man death reigned over all mankind.

16—Now if any man will show to me the justice, mercy, and love of God in originating and continuing such a system as involves a whole world in innumerable pains and miseries, and finally in death for one sin of one man, I will, from his premises, engage to show that the same justice, mercy, and love may be more brightly displayed in punishing for ever and ever all wicked men for their own sins. I have in part, in this controversy, done this very thing, and you passed it by with scarcely a single glance of your eye. "There is no one so blind as he that will not see."

17—"What a head and heart" had Jesus when he said, "He that speaks a word against the Holy Spirit has NEVER forgiveness—shall not be forgiven, neither in this world nor that which is to come; but is liable to *eternal damnation*:" when he said, "Broad is the way to destruction, and wide is the gate, and many go in thereat:" when he said, "*Better* for that man he had never been born:" when he shall say, "Depart, you CURSED, into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels"! What a head and heart had Paul when he said, "Behold, you despisers, and wonder and perish:" when he said, "As many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law:" "He will reward indignation, wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil:" "Christ shall reign till he has put all his enemies UNDER HIS FEET:" "Every one shall receive in his body according to the evil he has done, when we all appear before the tribunal of Christ—knowing THE TERROR of the Lord, we forewarn you:" when he said, "They shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven in flaming fire TAKING VENGEANCE on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." What a head and heart had Peter when he said, "*Many* shall follow their pernicious ways, whose damnation slumbereth not; for God, who spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to Tartarus, into chains of darkness, to be reserved to judgment; if he spared not the old world, drowning it all but Noah; if he burned up Sodom and Gomorrah, will he spare these wicked men, these cursed children, for whom, as Jude says, the blackness of darkness is reserved for ever! What shall I more say? What a head and heart had the beloved John when he said, "Whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." "He that is unjust and unholy, let him be unjust and unholy *still*. They who keep his commandments shall enter into the heavenly city, without which shall be the dogs, sorcerers, whoremongers, murderers, and all LIARS—preachers of false doctrine. Wonder not, then, that we should dare to speak in this style.

Faithfully yours, A. CAMPBELL

EDUCATION.

CRAGFONT, *Tennessee*, December 13, 1838.

Respected Sir,

I HAVE the honor to transmit you, for publication in the "Millennial Harbinger," a communication of mine to General *William Trousdale* of this state; and which he, perhaps very properly, assumed the responsibility of publishing to the world, as you will see by his note to the Editor of the journal in which it first appeared.

I am aware that the character of the letter is not precisely such as comports with the spirit and objects of a purely *theologi-*

cal work; but I trust, when my reasons for thus desiring its publication shall be duly weighed, that you will be induced to relax some of your rigid *rules of exclusion* in its favor—and the more especially, as it embraces a subject which, next to *religion* and *morality*, is of the very highest importance to mankind: I mean the subject of *primary* and POPULAR NATIONAL EDUCATION.

I believe that the first movements toward reformations, in the Romish religious code of abuses, long practised against the pure spirit of the gospel, were made by individuals calling themselves PROTESTANTS, because they boldly *protested* against the errors and superstitious abuses of the Romish dogmas and practised impositions of that church, which had, for many ages, disgraced and degraded the *rational endowments* of humanity. And, sir, I as firmly believe, as I do in the identity of my own existence, or in any thing else equally and palpably true, that the period has now arrived when reformations in the principles of *national education* are as loudly and imperiously demanded, by the advanced and hourly improving mental condition of civilized nations, as ever were reformations of abuses against the pure spirit of the gospel of Christianity.

The American revolution gave birth to a new era in the intellectual and political history of mankind, which ought to have been marked by correspondent and equally distinguished revolutions in the ancient and absurd systems of education. The revolution of '76 was not the result of chance, or the ephemeral production of an hour; the principles on which it was founded had been silently and almost imperceptibly maturing, in our mental and national character, for the lapse of many preceding generations—and it only required the last efficient *spark* of British injustice and outrage, to explode their combustible and resistless energies on the world! They were produced by the native impulses, and inherent germinations of human intellect, when exempted from the restraints of political oppression, and the brutifying and degrading superstitions of ecclesiastical despotism. And, sir, to speak with my usual independence and candor when addressing you, all your *attempted* and *distinguished successes*, in reforming and purifying from corruptions and absurd superstitions, the vital and genuine religion of the true scriptural doctrines, have resulted from the *very same principles* of INTELLECTUAL IMPROVEMENT, which shed an unfading and imperishable splendor on the causes and events of the American revolution!—Reformations in religious codes and abuses can go no further than the *moral* and *intellectual* freedom of the human mind can be protected and fostered by the liberal policy and tolerant spirit of popular political power. The despotism of

intellectual restraints and oppressions are as fatal to the interests of genuine religion as to the growth, liberal policy, tolerant spirit, and durability of free republican institutions—and the whole history of the human species demonstrates these important truths, too often overlooked.

Since the publication of my letter to Gen. *Trousdale*, in which my opinions on the subject of popular national education are given in the most condensed form practicable, I have been advised that the new and original positions it assumes, and essays to maintain, are likely to encounter much severe, and perhaps malignant opposition, especially from those whose *narrow prejudices* have been pricked from their slumbers by its doctrines, and who probably contemplate in perspective, should the sound *common sense* and *rational views* it embraces, meet encouragement from the popular judgment, not only being stripped of some of their *classic honors*, but many of them of their *daily bread:* for, sir, I hold it to be almost impossible to enumerate, with any precision, that great mass of our citizens, whose *avowed opinions*, on all occasions, are invariably in unison—right or wrong—with their pecuniary or ambitious interests!—Hence arises most of the difficulties attending innovations, and even essential and necessary amendments, in church and state. These obstacles spring not from any native obliquity of the human mind; truth is the grand object of unsophisticated human intellect: in fact, sir, it is its sustenance, the real cause of its strength and elevation—the element alone in which it does not degenerate and decay.

You have had many and stubborn difficulties to surmount, in attempting to bring back the CHURCH OF CHRIST to the original *purity* and *simplicity* of its character; and the obstacles I have just stated, as arising from the influence of *pecuniary* or *ambitious* impulses, against innovations in our systems of national education, in cases almost innumerable, are not among the least powerful which you have had, in theological reformations, to face boldly—to encounter—and to overcome. And, with respect to the sectarian and visionary dogmas in theology you have had to combat, I will mention one which is intimately connected with the *popular study* of the dead languages, and which has probably escaped your usually subtile and searching perception of causes. I wish here to be distinctly and discriminatingly understood: my letter to General *Trousdale* does not discountenance the study of the dead languages, *Latin* and *Greek*, by those who have a strong natural bias for their acquisition, and native and powerful *genius* sufficient to detect the *dross of fable*, and separate it from the *bullion of truth*, they embrace; I mean merely, that they are inutile, dangerous to weak and puerile

minds, and entirely useless to the great mass of the people, as forming an integral and essential portion of popular and national education.

There is one principle of education, individually and every where found, as invariable in its operations, as it is extensive and universal in its influence—it is this; the reign and mental influences of the *imagination commence* precisely where those of *truth* and the *human understanding end*:—and hence, sir, the danger of exposing the ignorant, youthful, and inexperienced mind to accounts of monstrosities that never existed but in the visions of poetic delirium, and to fabulous narratives, the *philosophy* and *wisdom* of former times, which absolutely defy all rational belief!—It is from minds thus educated, thus misled, or rather thus *uneducated*, in the principles of rationality and truth —minds utterly disqualified by *nature* and want of *original genius*, for subtile and piercing discriminations, between fact and fiction, truth and error—and minds in which the *imagination* has been cultivated at the expense of the *understanding*, that most of your difficulties have originated, and yet continue to spring. The lean and meagre smatterings of the dead languages, the acquisition of which has probably taken up but a few months, or at most two or three years, have been estimated by the *arithmetic of human vanity* as sufficient to qualify many of our EXCEEDINGLY LEARNED men to peruse and fully understand the Scriptures in the original tongues; whereas, in my opinion, it would require nothing less than the devotion of a long life of severe application to those languages, and that too with undivided attention, to achieve these great objects. Hence, sir, have been brought into existence, in the lapse of the last and present centuries, so many vague, conjectural, and visionary creeds of theology, and their almost infinity of branches, limbs, sprays, twigs, and air drawn filiations. I have just remarked, that the visions of the imagination commence precisely where the influences of *rationality* and the powers of the *human understanding* terminate—this solves the whole problem of theological disagreements, and accounts at once for the almost infinity of religious creeds. The visionaries, whose imaginations engender them in ignorance, folly, and fanaticism, are every where to be found; to enumerate the progeny of their wild and spurious deliriums, would be impossible; you have specimens of what I mean, from Joanna Southcote, down to Joe Smith the Mormon—and from Joe, upward, almost or quite as far as your excellent good sense will permit you to ascend: and the grand misfortune is, and one with which *good sense* and *rationality* have ever had to contend, that these fanatical visionaries invariably mistake the wild deliriums of their ignorance and superstition for the

inspirations of Heaven, and propagate their tenets with an obstinacy and devotion which they have the solemn audacity to presume is identified with MARTYRDOM for the realities of GOSPEL TRUTH!

And now, sir, in conclusion of this perhaps already too prolix letter, I will state some additional reasons for wishing you to admit my communication to Gen. Trousdale into the pages of the Millennial Harbinger:—and 1st. I am unwilling that the sentiments and opinions it advances, both of which are connected with *reformations* in our existing and erroneous systems of popular and national education, should perish on the ephemeral columns of a news journal. 2d. I think that salutary reformations in religion, the real and avowed objects of the HARBINGER, are as nearly connected, if not absolutely identified with reformations in education, as it is possible to conceive. 3d. I have little doubt that the progress and advancement in elevation and power of the American popular and national intellect, announces the necessity of the reformation in our systems of education, contemplated and enforced in that letter. 4th. I believe that the Millennial Harbinger, from the peculiar moral energy and elevation of its character, will reach posterity and future times:—and, as the first reformers of the abuses and errors of the Romish church PROTESTED openly against those errors and abuses, I wish it to appear of *record* that I was the first American citizen who solemnly *protested* against the existing and systematized errors and abuses of American education, as unfit and disqualifying for the republican youth of the nation, and pointed out what I believed to be the true principles of republican intellectual culture. And 5th and lastly, I believe that most of our citizens, who ever have, do now, or ever will, despise and underrate the nobility, justice, and equitable simplicity of our moral, religious, literary, or political institutes, have—do now—and always will, suck the poison and malignity of their prejudices against our country and its free republican principles, from the literary *aristocratic* trash with which our country abounds, from foreign *monarchical countries;* and, I further believe, that all works ought to be excluded from our schools—common libraries—and even tables and parlor windows, exclusive of such as are PURELY SCIENTIFIC, which have a tendency to corrupt the taste and moral purity of our youth, to lower and degrade our country in the estimation of the rising generation, or to create and nurture false principles of merely artificial rank—unknown to nature, and to the graduations of moral justice, elevated sentiments of humanity, and spotless honor!—Men of lofty native intellect, and high mental culture, acknowledge the claims of no artificial distinctions in rank, no nobility but that of GOD'S creation, no

superiority of character, not founded on superior virtue and intelligence: this ought to be our national character, and would be such in the lapse of *three generations* to come, if parents and teachers would fix high standards of emulation in the minds of children and youth, banish all rivalships in low and ignoble pursuits, and exclude from the contemplations of the youthful and unformed mind all books calculated to mislead their judgment of *human excellence*, to deprave their taste, and to lower their sense of moral virtue. But these objects, sir, can never be achieved, nor can our national character ever greatly surmount its present elevation, while parents inflate the minds of their offspring with the *soap-bubble* frivolities of foreign literary trash—and call it LEARNING, and imbue their intellects with the fictions of ancient romance, destructive of the very instinct of energy and truth—and call it WISDOM!

With great and most sincere respect, I am, my dear sir, your obdt. servt. CHARLES CASSEDY.

THE DIRECT AND IMMEDIATE INTENTION OF THE CHRISTIAN INSTITUTION.— *ESSAY II.*

In the preceding essay upon this deeply interesting subject, it is assumed that the benign and blissful intention of Christianity is personal holiness; or a life entirely devoted to God. Now this assumption is not merely predicated upon the express declaration of the divine testimony, that "without holiness no man shall see the Lord;" though this most expressly establishes the truth of the assumption. For if holiness *alone* can qualify us for the enjoyment of the divine presence, then surely the acquisition of it *is, and must be*, the primary and proper intention of an institution, the professed object of which is, to save us from our sins, to reconcile us to God, and so to prepare us for heaven. But that this is its proper and primary intention, is, moreover, demonstrably evinced in the exhibition of its radical, constituent, and formative principles; namely, the peculiar delight and sublime intentions of the divine philanthropy, as expressed and manifested in man's original creation, and highly dignified station; but still more strikingly after his ungrateful and inexcusable apostacy, in the divine procedure for his redemption, reconciliation, and exaltation to the most complete and intimate enjoyment of the divine presence and glory. See Gen. i. 26 and ii. 8, 9, 15, 17.; Psalm viii. 5.; Heb. ii. 6.; Phil. ii. 9.; John iii. 16.; Rom. iii. 24, 25, 26. and v. 6, 8, 9, 10 and viii. 26.; Gal. iv. 4, 5, 6.; Rom. v. 5. and viii. 16, 17.; Eph. ii. 22.; Rev. iii. 21. and xxi. 7.; John v. 4.; Rev. i. 5, 6. What a transcendant display of the divine philanthropy is exhibited in the above quotations! Yet these are but a small portion of the divine testimony upon this transcendantly great, blissful, and glorious subject. And as if all that has been divinely spoken and done in favor of man, from his creation till his final consummation in the divine image and glory, were insufficient to express the intensely deep and inconceivable interest that God has taken in our nature, condition, and destiny, mankind are represented as the special object of the divine love, complacency and delight from everlasting. See Prov. viii. 12, 17, 22, 23, 30, 31.; Jeremiah xxxi. 3.: Matthew xxv. 34.: John xvii. 5, 24.; Eph. i. 3, 4.; 2 Tim. i. 9.; Titus i 2.; 1 Peter i. 20.; Rev. xvii. 8.——I, wisdom, dwell with prudence. By me kings reign and princes decree justice. I love them that fear me; and they that seek me early shall find me.—The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his ways before his works of old. I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning ere ever the earth was.—Then was I by him as one brought up with him; and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always

before him; rejoicing in the habitable parts of his earth, and my delights were with the sons of men. Yea, I have loved you with an everlasting love; therefore with loving kindness have I drawn you. Come, you blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world. Father, glorify thy Son with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee, before the world was: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world. Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly things in Christ, according as he has chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy, and without blame before him in love. Who has saved us, and called us with a holy calling, according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began. In hope of eternal life, which God, who cannot lie, promised before the world began.—For as much as you know that you were not redeemed with corruptible things—but with the precious blood of Christ, who verily was foreordained before the foundation of the world; but was manifested in these last times for you, who by him do believe in God, who raised him from the dead, and gave him glory, that your faith and hope might be in God.—They that dwell on the earth shall wonder, whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world; when they behold the beast that was, and is not, and yet is.

Now, is it not demonstrably evident, that nothing short of a captivating, constraining, overwhelming love to God, can be the effect of a realizing belief of the above items of the divine testimony? And, if so, surely holiness is, and *necessarily must be*, the immediate, just, and proper intention of an institution originating from, and founded in, the existence and developement of the establishing truths contained in the above quotations. For what is holiness but the love of God?—That is the love of the divine character as displayed in the creation, government, and disposal of his rational creatures: and especially of his highly favored creature man: in his procedure towards whom, he has given the greatest possible display of his infinite abhorrence of sin, that deadly moral evil, which destroys the happiness of his rational creatures, wherever it happens to take place; wherefore the hatred of it must necessarily be proportioned to his love of *them*.

In order, then, to our realizing this captivating display of the divine philanthropy, let us seriously consider the above items of the divine testimony, which go to present man as the exalted object of the divine attachment and attention—"Angels, Authorities, Principalities, and Powers being made subject to the Son of Man; who is exalted far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come:—made higher than the heavens:—who has ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill *all things*:" that is, *all hearts*:—all things being put under his feet as the Head of his body, the church; which, of course, is thereby exalted with him to a joint participation of his glory; as is expressly declared in the above quotations. Now, realizing these things, must we not supremely *love Him, who first loved us?* For, as saith the Apostle, "We love God because he *first loved us*." And again—"The love of Christ constrains us to live (entirely devoted) to Him, who died for us; wherefore we labor that we may be accepted of him. It is manifestly, therefore, this constraining influence of the love of God, and of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, as exhibited in the divine testimony, which is the very principle of that holiness without which none can please and enjoy the Lord; nor live *entirely* devoted to him.

T. C.

News from the Churches.

Centreville, Wayne county, Indiana, September 12, 1838.

There are about 20 of us in this vicinity; but we are not yet very regular in our congregational operations. The prejudices of this community, three years ago, were violent against what we plead for; but they are fast wearing: my audiences are generally large

and attentive. Methodism and Quakerism are the two prominent and popular *isms* in this region, which you know are very antagonistical to the plain old gospel. Our section of the country is full of small villages, in the majority of which I have preached, but at great intervals; so that little good has been done beside disabusing the public mind. Calls for preaching are numerous and increasing, from all directions.

S. K. HOSHOUR.

Adamsville, M'Nairy county, Tennessee, September 14, 1838.

We have been much refreshed by a visit of brother J. Jones, of Giles county, Tenn. We commenced a meeting on last Friday, which continued five days and nights. The result was, ten persons (including two of my children) confessed and were immersed for remission of sins—one from the Baptists, and six from other congregations of the brethren united with us, making an addition of seventeen. We had large and attentive congregations. There appeared to be a very general good effect on the hearers: some left the meeting weeping; but brother Jones and myself were almost exhausted, so we had to discontinue our meeting. We meet almost unanimously on every Lord's day and break the loaf, notwithstanding we are scattered over a large district of county. We number about 80 at present—all in love and union. Blessed be the Lord our God! Give glory to Him, all his children, for his blessings through the gospel. J. H. DUNN.

Hebron, Washington county, New York, September 24, 1838.

We have had a four days' meeting in Russet, where our congregation met for worship, at which meeting we were assisted by our excellent and highly esteemed brethren Shepard and Bartlett; the former from Auburn, Cayuga county, and the latter from Victory—both good men and true. During their labors we immersed fourteen. The meeting commenced on Thursday, August 30, and continued until the Wednesday following. Among those who bowed to King Jesus were a gentleman educated for the *bar*, and his lady; also, a Mr. W. Hopkins, a highly respectable, intelligent, and honorable member of the Congregationalist Church, (Russet,) arose in the meeting; and, after a few very pertinent remarks, requested immersion in the name of the Lord. Also, a Baptist lady, who had strenuously opposed us through the meeting, having attended most, if not all the time, and only the evening previous to the close, requested an interview with me in consequence of some expressions in the closing prayer for that evening which I made, and concluded that we did not preach the gospel—this lady, the next day or evening that closed the meeting, arose and publicly declared herself as perfectly convinced that we had the truth and gave it faithfully to the world. I have immersed about twenty-two since I last wrote you, exclusive of four persons whom brother Shepard immersed while with us. The sects are resorting to their old means to oppose us. May the good Lord have pity upon them!

G. J. WHITE.

Euclid, Ohio, October 2, 1838.

The kingdom of the Messiah is increasing. Last week brother Moss and myself spent three days in Mogadore, Portage county, and immersed ten sinners into the Lord for remission of sins—and one in Hudson, on our way there. This week we have been four days here, having the assistance of brethren Moody and Robinson—and have immersed eight others. This is more than we had expected could be effected in this place. But our weapons are "mighty, through God, to the pulling down of strong holds." Praise the Lord for his goodness! A. P. JONES.

M'Donough county, Illinois, October 2, 1838.

Since my last letter to you, I have been exploring a section of country west of the Mississippi, and have the pleasure to say that I have never seen a people that manifested more regard for the gospel. I attended a two days' meeting; and although only nine persons were immersed, the people listened to the truth with interest and delight. I left them to attend a meeting in Mednanon county, Illinois, to commence on Saturday before the 4th Lord's day in September. Nothing very interesting was done there. Only one person confessed the Lord and obeyed him. Last Lord's day I attended a meeting in

Fulton, in company with brother Philip Mulky, Jr. We had a glorious time: the disciples were revived, many were deeply affected with the truth, and four confessed the Lord and were introduced into his kingdom by immersion into his name. May the good Lord bless the brethren! ROBERT FOSTER.

Euclid, Cuyahoga county, Ohio, October 11, 1838.

I am happy to inform you, as well as the brethren elsewhere, that since I last wrote you we have had some happy times in this section of country. We have had the pleasure of hearing some twenty persons make the good confession that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour of man, and of seeing them buried with the Captain of our salvation in order to the remission of their sins. This makes us rejoice as well as the angels in heaven: If the angels could feel such a deep interest in the salvation of human kind as to cry, "Glory to God in the highest! on earth peace and good will to man!" ought not saints to rejoice in the Father of their spirits when they see their fellows turning to God and bowing to the peaceful sceptre of the Prince of Peace?

W. O'CONNER.

Russelville, Putnam county, Indiana, October 24, 1838.

The good cause is still progressing in this country. Recently 15 have been immersed in this and the adjoining neighborhoods. May the Lord spread the truth far and wide!

JOHN M. HARVEY.

Indianapolis, Indiana, October 27, 1838.

Sixteen have been added to the church here since the 25th of September through the instrumentality of brother William M. Brown, who has been laboring among us for some weeks past. The prospects, I think, are as good now as they have ever been in this place for the success of the truth, could we only have regular preaching by able proclaimers: but, alas! the laborers are few, and those that are in the field are but poorly sustained.—O! that the brethren of this reformation would awake to a sense of their duty in this particular! E. K. SMITH.

Minerva, Stark county, Ohio, October 27, 1838.

For some time past the deceitfulness of riches and the spirit of speculation seemed as though they would destroy the seed of virtue in the minds of the disciples in this place and its vicinity. But lately this spirit is broken, and the gospel again flourishes. We have had two big meetings lately, and the enemy has been driven at the sword's point, and some of them captured and made lawful subjects of the Saviour's kingdom.

At the first meeting, labored by brother George Lucy, there were 9 additions, at the last, which has just ended, laborers Atherton, Hartzel, and Laufue, which held three days, 19 additions; at the interval between the two meetings, 7—making the number of 35 in a few weeks. This is quite animating and encouraging; and I hope we shall do better still, for the harvest is quite ripe here. JOHN WHITACRE.

Christian county, Kentucky, November 6, 1838.

The cause we plead is progressing slowly in this vicinity. In the three last months there have been 35 or 40 immersions by brother M'Bride and myself, at Salem, Mount Zion, and West Fork; and by brother Black, at Liberty, some 3 or 4. On Saturday before 3d Lord's day inst. we expect to have a convention of churches, the Lord willing, at Orkadelphia, to elect and send out an Evangelist; but whether we shall succeed is doubtful. May the Lord bless you and prosper your labor! J. B. RADFORD.

Nottingham, Harrison county, Ohio, Nov. 15, 1838.

I hasten to inform you that I had the satisfaction of organizing a new congregation on the 10th inst. in Washington, (about 10 miles west of the Nottingham congregation,) numbering about 40 disciples—*eleven* having been received by immersion, and several more from the sects, within a few days. The prospect for a great ingathering is altogether flattering. Since my June letter several have been received in the Liberty congregation, (Guernsey county,) as well as at Nottingham and divers other places. I *long* to see the knowledge of the Lord prevail! ROBERT COOK.

Clarence, Erie county, New York, November 16, 1838.

I have recently closed a series of lectures, on religious topics, in Williamsville, in this county, and had the satisfaction of enlisting *twelve* persons under the banner of the Captain of our salvation, beside removing a great amount of religious prejudice. The disciples in this section are very much encouraged, and fully determined to do something honorable to themselves by way of sustaining a proclaimer in Western New York. Our very much esteemed brother Benjamin Hearshey, at whose house I once had the pleasure of taking tea with yourself, told me that he would cheerfully contribute one hundred dollars per annum to that object, if the disciples could be supplied with an able proclaimer of a good reputation, and one who cannot only convince, but also persuade men to be reconciled to God. Can you send them such a brother?

S. E. SHEPARD.

Florida, Missouri, November 20, 1838.

In the past summer I caused five disciples to unite in Santa Fee in a congregational capacity. They now number upwards of 20. They are walking in the ordinances of the New Testament. At the last meeting in Paris 12 made the good confession. The gospel is gaining slowly in this county. Since I last wrote you 4 have been added to this congregation.

H. THOMAS.

CONVERSIONS FROM CATHOLICISM.

Elder J. M. Peck, the senior Editor of the "Western Pioneer," states that conversions from the Catholics are quite frequent. In one small district of Missouri, fifty such conversions occurred. More than one half of them united with the Baptist churches, and one of them is now a Baptist minister and home missionary. Conversions from the Catholic religion are so frequent in the Baptist and Methodist churches as to excite no surprize, and they are scarcely ever mentioned in distinction from other cases. *Religious Herald.*

THE HORRORS OF WAR.

The siege and sack of Troy is said to have cost the lives of hundreds of thousands of Grecians and Trojans. The loss of the Persians in the battle of Issus was 100,000, and in that of Arbela 300,000. Julius Cesar, on a single occasion, annihilated an army of 363,000 Helvetii. On another he destroyed a body of German emigrants, men, women, and children, amounting to 430,000. The number of Jews that perished in the siege of Jerusalem amounted to 1,100,000; and in a war afterwards waged against them by Adrian, their loss was 580,000. The Emperor Claudius, on one occasion, destroyed an army of 300,000 Goths, Heruli, &c. Attila, surnamed the Scourge of God, was defeated by Actius, in the battle of Chalons, with the loss of 160,000. In the last battle of Gengis Khan with the rebels of Tangut, there fell 300,000. And in the great battle of Angoria, between Tamerlane and Bajazet, in which were engaged 1,000,000 combatants, 300,000 men were slain.

Such has been the sacrifice of life in a *few* of the *many* conflicts which have occurred in this great slaughter-house of the universe. What, then, must have been the sum total in all the battles ever fought? [*Congress of Nations.*]

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER,

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME III.——NUMBER III.

BETHANY, VA. *MARCH*, 1839.

THE GOSPEL—*No. I.*

"Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also you have received, and wherein ye stand: by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, *how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures.*" 1 Cor. xv. 1—4.

The gospel of Christ, presenting, as it does, eternal life and happiness to the human family, deserves, for its own sake, a full, careful, and unprejudiced examination. The mere announcement that everlasting joys and undying honors are placed within the grasp of mortals, challenges at once attention and respect. The lofty hopes which it inspires are allied to the dearest earthly aspirations of the human heart, and the highest aims of worldly ambition; yet they surpass and include them all, as the "glad waters of the dark blue sea" overwhelm and drink up the glittering spray upon the mossy rock which is covered with the flowing tide. And, as to the permanency of their fruition, contrasted with that of sublunary anticipations, they are like the star-paved heavens, compared with the fallen domes and decaying palaces of ruined Tyre; or as the ever-during forests of Lebanon, to the broken column and mouldering capital which bears, as though in mockery, the inscription, "Roma Æterna."

Such is the character of the exceeding great and precious promises of the gospel to him who receives it in its original purity and fulness. It is requisite, however, in the present dis-

tracted state of the religious community, that we should, before addressing our attention to the gospel, direct our thoughts to some important preliminary considerations. For the day of primitive Christianity, which once beamed so brightly, has been obscured by the murky darkness of human folly, ignorance, and guilt. In these preternatural circumstances, every thing in religion has assumed a false and sombre coloring; and men can no longer see the truth as it is, nor themselves as they ought. In the gloomy valley the host are troubled; uncertainty and distraction prevail, and each man's hand is raised against his brother. It is necessary, therefore, that, under the guidance of reason and experience, we should ascend the favoring acclivity, and seek a position elevated above the dusky vapors, that we may enjoy a better atmosphere, and obtain a clearer view beneath the undimmed radiance of heaven.

It may be scarce worth while to remind the reader that in all the affairs of men, and in every subject submitted to human investigation, whether it belong to Art or Science, Religion or Government—truth, or that which really is, alone merits regard and veneration. Falsehood, or that which is unreal, can never profit any one, Such base coin proves only the poverty of its possessor; and that mind must be indeed vain and empty which can rest satisfied with the inanity of deceit, when it might be enriched with the substantial realities of truth. But if the possession of truth be desirable in those departments of human knowledge which appertain to this present life, it is supremely so with regard to religion. Here, indeed, it is more precious than rubies, and more to be coveted than the gold of Ophir.

Hence it is, that in examining a subject of so much importance, the most particular attention should be paid to those rules and principles which the experience of the world has shown to be absolutely necessary to the discovery of truth. The first of these is, that THE MIND MUST BE FREE FROM PREJUDICE.

Prejudice is *pre-judgment*—judgment formed beforehand without examination. It is obvious that one whose mind is thus pre-occupied is unable to receive the truth. He who would possess himself of truth must have the tablets of his judgment

pure, and ready to receive a fair and clear impression from the evidence submitted. He must erase every image from his memory and every feeling from his heart, so that he may be as though he had never before heard any thing whatever in relation to the matter presented. So well known is this, that in courts of law a man is regarded as wholly incompetent and unfit to hear evidence, or sit in judgment, unless he can truly testify under the solemnity of an oath that his mind is uninfluenced by prejudice, and free from every bias and prepossession.

And yet, however plain these things are, and how careful soever men are to recognize their importance, and enforce their practice in regard to every thing of a worldly nature; they pay little or no attention to them in religion. They imagine that, filled as they are with the cherished principles, and predominant influences, imbibed, during youth, from the deep-springing fountains of education and habit, they have yet room for conflicting sentiments, and capacity to judge the claims of other systems, or to estimate correctly the merits of their own. But this is as morally impossible, as it is physically so, that two things can be in the same place at the same time. "To expect," says Boyle, "that people, zealous for one religion, should examine the other maturely, equitably, and accurately, is like pretending that a person can be a fair judge between two women, with one of whom he is in love, while he has an aversion for the other.—Lycidas is desperately in love with Urania, and mortally hates Corinna; tell us, says some one, which of them is the most charming; examine the matter: he will promise to do so, but to a certainty he will pronounce for Urania; and, not contented with preferring her to Corinna, he will prefer her also to all other women."

It would seem, indeed, that, in society, the many are religion*ists*; and the few religious. And there can be no question that the jealousies, controversies, and enmities which alienate and disturb Christendom, are perpetuated, for the most part, by that unjust prejudice or intolerant bigotry which induces men to decide from feeling rather than from evidence; and leads them to misunderstand and condemn each other for want of candid examination. In the language of Dr. Price, this "prejudice may

be compared to a misty morning in October. A man goes forth to an eminence, and he sees, at the summit of a neighboring hill, a figure apparently of gigantic stature—for such the imperfect medium through which he is viewed would make him appear. He goes forward a few steps, and the figure advances towards him. The size lessens as they approach. They draw still nearer, and the extraordinary appearance is gradually but sensibly diminished: and at last they meet, and perhaps the person he had taken for a monster, proves to be his own brother."

A second point of great moment in the pursuit of truth, is, that the *whole of the evidence be heard*, and the WHOLE TRUTH *received*. The evils which may arise from defective testimony and partial views of truth are incalculably great—greater often than those resulting from falsehood itself. Hence, to prevent erroneous and oppressive decisions, and preserve the purity of Justice inviolate, the witness is adjured to tell, not "the truth" merely, but "the *whole truth*." For experience and reason teach, that he who hears or examines a matter imperfectly, can never arrive at just conclusions. He can neither enjoy, nor properly appreciate truth, any more than the prisoner can estimate the beauties of the landscape from the partial glimpse which he obtains through the narrow grating in the massy wall of his dungeon. It is a partial exhibition of truth, which, like the gilding upon counterfeit coinage, gives currency to delusion, and success to imposture.

There is no doubt that this error has much to do with the present disturbed state of the Christian profession. Partyism springs from partial views of truth. There is not a single denomination which, along with its peculiar heresies, does not acknowledge some tenets which are indubitably true. And it can be just as easily shown, that there is not a sect in Christendom which embraces the whole truth, in doctrine and practice, as it was received by the first Christian churches.

It is a melancholy reflection that the unity of the church and the integrity of truth—the sparkling diamond which once graced the coronal of apostolic faithfulness, should be thus broken up into so many insignificant fragments. Christianity, indeed, may now be compared to a ravelled web: each party has run off with a

few of its threads, and interwoven them with the flimsy texture of its own many-colored robes—not one of them has had the ability, like Sampson, to carry off the whole of it. Or, it is like an ancient Grecian temple, erected for a Divinity, and once magnificent and perfect, but now overthrown by the rude hand of violence, and the materials carried off to compose a part of the mean fabric of the peasant—the richly sculptured marble, as in modern Athens, has become the stepping-stone to the mud-walled hut of squalid poverty!

But again: It is possible for the whole truth to be received, yet rendered inoperative by dilution, or injurious by corrupt additions. We should be careful, therefore, to embrace nothing but the truth, and to preserve its simplicity unimpaired—to seek only the pure bullion, and to keep it untarnished and undrossy.

There is, however, yet another point of great importance to the successful pursuit of truth, which we shall consider in our next.

R. R.

THE POWER OF SILENCE.

"Silence and Darkness! solemn sisters; twins
From ancient Night, who nurse the tender thought
To reason." YOUNG.

It seems not a little remarkable that our inquirers after truth, and our writers upon logic have, as it were with one consent, omitted to notice the vast amount of knowledge, and the overwhelming force of argument that are to be found in silence. It is an old adage that 'silence implies consent;' and what an admirable convenience it is which enables a man not only to start as many new subjects as he pleases, but always to decide every question exactly to suit himself!

But although none of our standard authors have, so far as I know, formally introduced silence amongst the leading principles of reasoning and scientific investigation; yet, in practice, it is astonishing how much advantage both speakers and writers have derived from it, especially when religion has been the theme. Here I need only mention the learned Dr. Warburton,

who wrote several large volumes upon the silence of the Jewish Lawgiver, in order to demonstrate that there is a future state of reward and punishment, because Moses said nothing at all about it. Silence, indeed, has commonly been regarded as wholly unanswerable, nor have I heard that any one ever seriously attempted to confute it, except a certain French controversialist, who, when his opponent resorted to this expedient, and maintained a profound silence, had the hardihood to publish a pamphlet in reply to it.

How many doctrines there are in religion solely dependant for their existence and their evidence upon the silence of the Bible! How many different denominations we have whose prominent and distinctive features are not described, and whose names even are not once mentioned in the Sacred Volume! Indeed I may fairly presume that at least nine-tenths of the religion of Christendom is founded upon what the Bible has *not* said. This single fact speaks louder than a thousand tongues to prove the power of silence. For, how strange a principle, or rather absence of principle, it must be, that can give origin to so many different religions and parties! It is, indeed, evidently much more efficient than words; seeing that while what the Bible does say can do no more than produce "*one* faith," what it does *not* say can give rise to *myriads* of opinions!

And not only so; but of how many controversies and of how much clamor is it not the cause! The silence of the Bible makes more noise than its oracles; for it is the occasion of almost all the contention and theological thunder of Christendom; since, for one dispute about what God has said, we shall find a thousand quarrels about what he has *not* said. This, to be sure, may be regarded as a perversion, or abuse of Bible silence; nevertheless, it shows not only its power, but the singular faculty which men possess of making something out of it so entirely contrary to it, like the ingenious person who wrote a Latin poem upon *Nothing*, and proved it to be an excellent *thing* at last, to the eternal honor of nihility. It may, however, be the natural tendency of things. Extremes are said to produce each other; and we know that it is the unusual quietude of the volcano which indicates the approaching earthquake; and that the tornado is born and bred in the sultry stillness of the forest.

But, concerning these controversies;—it is obvious that each one of them will have two sides; for none, except a few zealous advocates for sectarianism, ever yet saw a question with but one side to it. And here it is that the silence of the Bible gives to each party in a religious controversy an equal advantage: for neither of them being *land-bound*, it depends entirely upon their own skill and dexterity, which of them shall have the *weather-guage;* and it is their own courage and the force of their artillery which must decide the victory.

Heretofore, indeed, it has been, for the most part, the custom for all parties to take the affirmative. That is to say; if one party would take up, say five points, upon which the scriptures have not treated, and build upon these as the pillars of their system; the opposite party would not assume the negative of these, but would take the affirmative of five points directly opposite. Hence it is that we have such an immense variety of contrary doctrines sustaining so many different parties—not one of them ever having thought of building themselves upon a mere negation, which would have proved a very unsubstantial basis, and evinced great indiscretion, when the silence of the Bible gave them the opportunity of choosing whatever affirmatives might please them best.

Of late, however, this custom appears to be changing; and, instead of affirming every thing, it is becoming quite fashionable with many to deny every thing which is not distinctly stated in the scriptures. These are a sort of destructionists, that take a pleasure in pulling down every thing of this sort; yet these very persons profess to take the Bible alone for their guide, and though they act very inconsistently in not *imitating* its silence upon these matters, it shows nevertheless the power which the silence of the Bible has to keep up religious controversy and noise, and in how many different forms this controversy may be revived.

Nor is it likely ever to come to an end upon its present footing: for it is evident that when a doctrine is neither plainly stated, nor *necessarily* implied in the language of the scriptures, one party has just as much right to *affirm it, as the other has to deny it.* Now this is a point that deserves consideration, and the one to which these remarks are designed to direct the mind of

the reader, as the most striking advantage afforded by the silence of the Bible. It is very true, indeed, that all pretend that the doctrines they approve are taught in the scriptures. For the Bible has so good a character amongst all parties, and even with sceptics themselves, that each wishes to have it upon his side, and to make it appear that it countenances his views. And no doubt they are very sincere in their convictions, just as the votaries who pay their devoirs to a silent statue or painting of the Virgin and entreat her intercession, are persuaded that a gentle nod or an approving smile has signified her approbation. But as every one can boast equal tokens of favor, however opposite their sentiments may be, we should be inclined to think the *Madonna* no better than a coquette; and the Bible a contradictory and unintelligible volume, were we not happily enabled to attribute the circumstance to the power of a silence which every one construes to his own advantage.

This is a true solution of the difficulty. Not but that the question, Does the Bible teach the doctrine? is one which merits investigation. It is necessary to consider this in the very first instance, because, if decided in the affirmative, the doctrine is to be received as true. But the misfortune is, that the friends and supporters of the doctrine are they who take upon them to judge this matter, which, after all, is nothing but a question of language, which had it been long ago left, as it ought to have been, to candid grammarians instead of interested theologians, would have been decided in nine cases out of ten in favor of silence. For example: had it been referred to a mere grammarian to say if the *order* of the exercises of public worship be stated in Acts ii. 42. "And they unremittingly attended to the teaching of the Apostles, and the fellowship, and the breaking of the loaf, and the prayers," I doubt not he would have replied to this effect 'The historian relates here merely that the disciples attended to the exercises he names. He *does not say* they attended to them in public worship in the exact order in which he is pleased to enumerate them, and of course he was obliged to enumerate them in some order, if he mentioned them at all. Nor will the mere order of the words prove it, any more than the order of Paul's words, 1 Tim. iii. 16., would prove that Christ was

"preached to the Gentiles" before he was "received up into glory;" or in Heb. xii. 22–24., that a man can come to "the neavenly Jerusalem" before he comes to "Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant." There is no rule in grammar, nor any law in language which will justify such a conclusion.' How greatly would the sum total be augmented if this notion and all similar conceits were thus posted to the unsettled account of Bible silence!

Or, were our candid linguist thus interrogated: "Are there few that be saved?" or, to present the question in its modern garb, 'Are there any Christians, sir, among the sects?' or again, 'What will become of infants, idiots, Jews and Pagans?' he would reply: 'The scriptures are silent upon the subject.' When the question was propounded to Christ, he omitted to answer it; and bade the querists, in effect, to mind their own business and take care of themselves. "Strive ye," said he, "to enter in at the strait gate, for many will seek to enter in and shall not be able."' So deeply impressed, we perceive, was the Great Teacher himself with the value of silence in reference to such topics.

Here we may remark that it is one thing to deny that a doctrine is taught, in the scriptures, and quite another to deny the truth of the doctrine itself. There are, perhaps, many true doctrines of which the Bible says nothing. I say, perhaps; for, as before intimated, its silence gives as much liberty to affirm as to deny; and if they cannot be proved to be true, it is just as certain that they cannot be proved to be false. Hence the class of disputants last mentioned, who attempt to disprove every thing not revealed, keep up an endless war, and infringe upon the rights of man—since silence, as before observed, permits every one to decide these matters to his own mind.

I wish this whole subject were understood, and that due credit were given to silence for all the noise it has occasioned. And not only so, but that controvertists could see the freedom they enjoy in being outside of the Bible; and that it is its silence which affords so wide a field to all who find it more agreeable to reason and contend about what is not revealed, than to obey what is written. The Bible, in fact, does not afford them room enough for their combats, and I should like to see them turned out of it;

just as the decent inn-keeper, when travellers begin to fight within his house and break things, turns them out of doors to settle the quarrel the best they can in the open air.

I wish, too, that those who profess to take the Bible alone would confine themselves to it, instead of attempting to disprove human reasonings and opinions founded upon its silence. Their attempt reminds me of the position assumed by an acquaintance the other day, who observed that he could show it was impossible to prove any thing whatever from reason alone. But my good-natured friend forgot that he depended upon his reason to prove this very proposition—and was about to undertake to prove by reason that he could prove nothing by reason!

Now I should not like to attempt such a feat in relation to the reasonings of men, *pro* and *con*, upon things not revealed. But having said this much in praise of silence, will now, at least for a season, endeavor to observe it. D. A.

HAPPINESS—A FRAGMENT.

* * * * The goodness of God, or, in other words, his disposition to communicate happiness to others, prompted him not only to create beings with the capacity to receive happiness, but also to furnish the means through which that happiness was to be given. What innumerable classes, orders, and species of beings has not the Divine goodness thus originated, each capable of enjoying its own measure of bliss! The minute insect which dances in the sunbeam, may be as perfectly happy as the sagacious elephant in the freedom of his native forests. The capacity of the latter may be greater; but the enjoyment of the former, being equal to its capacity, is no less. No want is felt by either, nor can either form the wish or conceive the existence of higher felicity.

In proportion as the natures of beings are exalted, their capacity for enjoyment is increased, and the character of their enjoyments varied and elevated. Hence man is admitted to a moral and intellectual happiness more exquisite than that of sense, which he enjoys in common with inferior tribes. So varied and so vast, indeed, is man's capacity for happiness, that it seems almost infinite. The higher he ascends the more the prospect widens, and the more distant becomes the horizon which at first seemed to limit his desires. Earth and

heaven, a visible and an invisible universe, a natural and a spiritual world lay open before him their treasured joys; and should we suppose even all their resources exhausted, being created in the image of God, he can, like his Divine Father, find an unfailing fountain of happiness in giving happiness to others. R. R.

SIN—*A DIALOGUE.*

It was at that delightful season when the soul of the poet is inspired with song, and the youthful heart with love, that two friends set forth from the hospitable mansion of Paternus to take a morning walk.—One of them, whom we shall denominate Philander, was a little past the prime of life. A few grey hairs besprinkled his dark locks, but his tall and finely-formed figure still possessed the elasticity of youth; and while Time had traced upon his noble countenance some lines of thought or sorrow, these were almost concealed by the brighter tints of Christian hope and resignation. Eugenio, his companion, was many years his junior, and though the ardor of an unquenched zeal and the brilliancy of an unrepressed imagination lighted up his visage, he was endeared to Philander by many solid traits of character, and by a congeniality of mind and of pursuits.

Admiring the agreeable prospects presented to the eye of taste from various points as they ascended the slow-rising hills or climbed the steep, and descanting upon the beauty, immensity, and variety of the works of God, they came at length to the brow of a lofty eminence, where a beautiful grove overshadowed with its fresh and rich foliage the family cemetery of Paternus. Here, seated upon a grassy knoll from which the sun's first rays had already sipped the drops of dew, they continued their conversation.

Eugenio. How charmingly the hour harmonizes with the season! The grateful coolness of the morning breeze invigorates the frame, while the vernal influences stir the blood and fill the heart with a thousand delightful fancies. All nature feels the enchantment, from man the guilty monarch of these wide-spread demesnes, to the innocent Thrush which on yonder topmost spray gladdens his ears with its varied melody, as it hails at once the return of the day and of the year.

Philander. It is truly a pleasant time. And this spot is to me most agreeable. How fine a view it affords of the rich valley below, and of that romantic stream which after pursuing a straight course directly north more than half a mile, is turned suddenly to the south, and as though it sued for freedom, washes the feet of those rock-ribbed hills by which

it is imprisoned. But there are associations connected with this place of a more solemn and interesting kind. Around me are the tombs of many dear departed ones, with whom I have been long and intimately acquainted. Alas! how soon has this little cemetery become a crowded mansion—too small for pale Death's increasing family. Here have I seen entombed infancy robed in its beautiful innocence; childhood with its joys and tears; youth with its high hopes and budding charms; and age with its stores of knowledge and experience. And it has been to me a melancholy pleasure to hold converse with them here in the deep communings of the memory and the affections.

Eugenio. I can enter into your feelings; for there are some buried here with whom I also had formed an agreeable acquaintance. But the turn which these tokens of mortality have given to our conversation reminds me how many monitors we have of human ills. How often do they cast a shade of gloom over our happiest hours, as the swift rising cloud darkens the brightest day of spring!

Philander. But they germinate in us, if we properly receive their teachings, the seeds of wisdom, as the showers of spring give birth to the fruitage of summer. They warn us of the terrible effects and consequences of that mysterious influence, which we have agreed to call SIN: a little word, indeed. but it has a great and extensive meaning.

Eugenio. This is a subject upon which I have often wished to speak with you. I confess it seems to me as though I had very imperfect conceptions of the virulence of that contagion which seems to have spread throughout the universe, and so to have desolated our world that there is no place which may not be truly called Aceldama or Golgotha.

Philander. As the dark shades of night fly before the golden chariot of the sun, and we cannot overtake them; so does this topic, obscure and implicated, seem to evade elucidation and to mock pursuit. Yet, to continue the figure, as night, though we cannot outstrip its retreating swiftness, can nevertheless suddenly overshadow us with its dusky wings, this singular principle can, in like manner, overwhelm us with its insidious and wide-spreading power. But, alas! even our consciousness of its presence fails to give us ability to grasp it. Still, it is a subject of which we may learn something, for this very characteristic serves to give us some idea of its nature. Nay, it is one of which we should learn as much as we can; for among the lessons of instruction presented to the world in that best of books, the Bible, the knowledge of sin is not the least important.

Eugenio. We estimate every thing by comparison. Hence, while we regard some things as remarkable for weakness, insignificance, and

shortness of life; others appear to us no less so for power, magnitude, and durability. How small the animalculæ in a drop of water! How evanescent the ephemera, the offspring of a morning sunbeam, which attains to maturity at noon, and dies of old age in the evening! How mighty, on the other hand, the lion; how great the strength and longevity of the elephant! What is the slender reed, born of an April shower, trembling in the breeze, or trodden under foot, to the gigantic oak, the tardy product of a hundred years, lifting itself towards the heavens, and capable of resisting the storms of ages! Thus the darkness which you have just employed as an illustration of sin, conveys a lively idea of its character. Darkness is one of those wonderful and mysterious creations. It is not a mere negative. It is a real existence, for it may be rendered tangible, as in Egypt. And how ancient its dominion! Before the seas or rivers were; before the hills or mountains were brought forth, it reigned over the vast abyss unrivalled and alone. Nor is its dynasty terminated; for, to this hour, though a partner be admitted to the throne, it retains one half the sovereignty. How astonishing, too, its faculty of pervading every thing! So great is its tenuity that it enters every abode—the palace of the monarch and the cottage of the peasant. Light can be excluded by closing the shutters, as knowledge its antitype may be by closing the understanding; but darkness, the type of ignorance, cannot be shut out.

Philander. We are supplied with another illustration of our subject in the attraction of gravitation. This, too, existed in the beginning of the works of God, and is one of the most powerful and penetrating influences with which we are acquainted. It brings to the ground a leaf from the oak, and the oak itself with its majestic trunk and spreading boughs, when smitten by the woodman's axe. Nay, it extends its influences to the heavenly bodies, and from the sun himself even to the utmost verge of this vast universe, exerts its unspent energies.

Now were I to express in general terms my conceptions of this subject, I should say that sin is one of these strange influences, so permanent, so powerful, and so penetrating. It existed in the beginning of the creation of God, before his works of old. It overcame angels and archangels, though great in power and might, and precipitated them from the bright seats of glory in the heavens, down to the dreary regions of sorrow and perdition. There it chained them with darkness, and holds them in their melancholy prison-house until the day of judgment, when it will cast them into the everlasting fire. It invaded Eden also—entered the Paradise of man, as it had once intruded into the Paradise of God; and tried its power over men, as it had formerly over angels. Its reign, set up upon earth, continues to the present day.

It has extended its influence far and wide—has entered into every heart as darkness enters into every habitation. The dreadful consequences have been experienced by all in pain, sickness, sorrow, fear, despair, or death. It is the "king of terrors" who permits the conquerors of the world to triumph by the death of their enemies: he reserves it to himself to conquer the conqueror. The clasping arms of maternal love cannot shield the tender infant from his shaft, nor can the hoary sage evade his machinations by his wisdom. Insatiate Death knocks as readily at the portals of the royal palace, as at the cottage of the peasant. In short, the city and the country have been infected: the continents and the islands have caught the contagion; and were men even to set forth upon the wide ocean to pillage health and life from the balmy gales, the storm and tempest would there punish the piracy, and the unrelenting angel of destruction wreak his vengeance.

R. R.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

INCIDENTS ON A TOUR TO THE SOUTH.

NO. III.

Much as we have been accustomed to scenes of parting and bidding adieu, we have never learned to say *farewell* to a beloved brother, for a long or for an indefinite period, without feeling the mingled emotions of sorrow and joy, of hope and fear. The parting tear, though it be gilded with the bow of promise, with the joyful hope of an expected meeting where the signal of separation shall never be given, and the valedictory hand shall never be stretched out; yet springing from the fear of not meeting here, nor there, because of the incertitude which always hangs on a state of discipline and trial—sometimes gives a poignancy to the final adieu, and prompts an ardent desire for the arrival of that state where doubt shall never enter—where faith shall be vision—and hope, fruition. Sometimes, indeed, the evidence of sincerity, intelligence, and purity, on all sides, are so bright and full as to leave almost every thing to hope and nothing to fear; so that we part with the fullest confidence that the days of separation shall be few, and the years of social bliss—of "society, friendship, and love," shall not only be many, but unending. So parted we with many of our Virginia brethren; and with none more feelingly and confidently than our beloved brother Coleman, who saw us into the rail cars at Petersburg. We had bid farewell on the day before to brother and sister Goss, and our good brethren Watson and Poindexter, who, from Charlottesville to Amelia, and thence to Petersburg, had accompanied us; and it only remained now to sever the last link that bound us to the Old Dominion in the person of brother Coleman, and turn our face to the Carolinas.

From Petersburg to Charleston, by rail road, stage, and steam-boat, a distance of more than 400 miles, we were carried in about 48 hours. We rested 16 hours in Wilmington, and had a very pleasant passage aboard the North Carolina steam-boat in the Atlantic to the great commercial capital of the South, a distance of 170 miles, in about 14 hours. Fatigued, sick, and unable to speak, we detained in Charleston but some two hours; and finding the rail cars starting to Augusta, Geo., we took our passage to Blackville, Barnwell District. some 90 miles in the interior; where, at the rate of 15 miles an hour, we safely arrived in time for dinner.

In passing from the steam-boat in an omnibus, while yet the stars were shining upon us, through the ruins of the tremendous conflagration which has so desolated Charleston, the emporium of the South, I could not but think of those ancient cities, which, under the frown of indignant Heaven, had perished by fire, the sword, and the pestilence,—those dread ministers of the offended Majesty of the Universe. The yellow fever, which had raged with desolating fury during the fall months, had just subsided shortly before our arrival—indeed there were still some cases on hand—generally, however, convalescent. The plague thus treading so closely upon the heels of the fire, gave still a more dismal and devoted cast to the whole scene around us. The tottering walls—the solitary chimnies—the charred timbers strewed along the ground—the immense piles of ruins spread over whole squares, illuminated by the gleam of a meteor, in the still silence of the early dawn, broken only by the howlings of a dog and the wheels of our chariot, threw over the whole premises indescribable melancholy and over our spirits a grave thoughtfulness which associated the present with the past and the future, and reminded us of many sayings in the Book of God; so that almost involuntarily we asked, "Has there been evil in the city and the Lord has not done it?"

A man from the North says, "Is not this a strong indication of Heaven's vengeance against the cruelty and injustice of Southern slavery?" while a man from the South, pointing to New York in flames and in ruins a year before, says, "Is not that a strong evidence of the Divine displeasure against the violence of abolitionism: or, at least, against the injustice, avarice, cupidity, atheism, and libertinism of that ill-fated city?" Thus each interprets and applies the judgments of Heaven according to the whim or capriciousness of his circumstances; and thus the calamity is neutralized and unblessed to all, because neither sees the hand of the Lord in it, and neither reforms from the sins and iniquities which undoubtedly elicited these awful visitations.

As fallacious and deceitful reasoners are they who seek to explain the dire visitation of the pestilence, which deprived Charleston of many of its inhabitants, and also of much of its usual business, by finding the proximate cause of the calamity in the extraordinary heat of the late summer acting upon the ruined cellars and dilapidated walls of the depopulated portions of the city. Should I find the incendiary who had communicated the fatal spark, does that discovery turn the conflagration into a mere accident, and divest it of the character of a Divine punishment? or should the Doctors find the cause of the pestilence in the uncovered cellars which poured forth their pestiferous exhalations over the whole city, does such a fact prove that the hand

of the Lord was not in it! Then, indeed, if this be true philosophy, there can be neither a blessing nor a curse from God, unless he appear in person, and employ no means nor ministers in the affair! God sends his blessings and his punishments by the operation of means sometimes visible, *though oft unseen*, and not without the instrumentality of second causes does he at all visit the sons of men. And if it be true, as doubtless it is, that *natural evil* cannot visit the city if God does not send it, then indeed ought not the punishment be converted into chastisement by the sincere and timous reformation of the subjects of it! Our cities, generally, are the haunts of every species of iniquity and abomination, and when the "salt" of Christian righteousness fails to prevent universal corruption, God must either destroy the city or depart from the principles of his former government.

From Charleston to Blackville, indeed I might say to Augusta, a distance of some 136 miles, the rail road passes through a level, sandy, and piney desert. The long-leafed pine and the white sand make a beautiful contrast; and if there were only a few miles, instead of a few hundreds of this sort of country in North and South Carolina, it would be exceedingly interesting. But having passed over hundreds of miles of this piney desert, without a single hill to relieve the *tedium viae*, from Petersburg to Augusta, the monotony of everlasting sands and evergreens becomes oppressive, and one naturally sighs for the hill and dale, the lofty mountain and the deep valley, as one that is incarcerated in a Bastile sighs for daylight and liberty.

There are, indeed, some rich and fruitful farms along the rivers and creeks of South Carolina, and here and there interspersed will occasionally be found a spot of better soil amongst the pine forests; still the proportion of fruitful soil to the barren, along the way from Petersburg to Augusta, is fearfully small for the hopes of a dense population. As we recede a hundred miles or more from the ocean, the soil somewhat improves; though it may be inferred from all that we have seen, it seldom improves to such a degree as would secure to it the character of fertility from a citizen of the West. It is presumed that one who travels from Savannah to Greenville Court-House, or from Charleston to Anderson, a distance of 250 miles from the sea, as the roads are, may form a tolerable conception of the soil, state of agriculture, and natural resources of the state. Having not only penetrated so far, but also passed some distance to the right and to the left, we conclude that slavery has proved no greater blessing to the far South than it has done to Virginia. It has exhausted whatever of natural fertility has been originally in the soil; and South Carolina seems to have once had a reasonable portion of fruitful territory. It has superinduced the worst system of agriculture which one could easily imagine; and it has imposed on the whole community views, feelings, and habits exceedingly inimical to the resuscitation of the soil and the agricultural improvement and advancement of the state. Tobacco, rice, and cotton are profitable crops for slave labor, but exceedingly unprofitable for land labor; and it seems they are predestined to live together: they are legally married in the South, and South Carolina favors no sort of divorces, literal or figurative, except in the conjugal affinities of States.

The sandy soil of the seaboard, or the silicious soil of the mountain and upland regions, though better than the former, is not adapted so

well as the climate and the products, to the system of slavery; and unless South Carolina turn her attention to machinery and manufactures, for which she is admirably adapted, especially her northern and western portions, by her immense water privileges and the salubrity and mildness of her climate in that direction, it is not within the visions of prophecy to foresee how she can escape, especially in her southern and seaboard regions, from being converted into a desert.

The rice plantations of the South are indeed rich and beautiful to the eye, exceedingly profitable to the master, but often terribly fatal to the slave; while the cotton plantations, neither so rich nor profitable to the master, are more agreeable, healthful, and comfortable to the slave. Slavery in all the South, so far as I have yet seen, is generally much more mild and comfortable than I had imagined. There are, it is true, some glaring exceptions; but public opinion is against these, and there is a decided improvement in the whole temporal and physical condition of this most unfortunate race of human beings—else all my former readings on this subject have been exceedingly erroneous. Still, with a few exceptions in the great aggregate, their moral culture is fearfully neglected.

It is in this respect that Christian sympathy, with all her bowels of compassion, yearns over the condition of the African slave. Good living, good clothing, good lodging, and no overworking will never compensate to the day of eternity, nor beyond that, the neglects of this pregnant category. "Masters, render unto your servants that which is *just* and *equal*, knowing that you have a Master in heaven"—before whom the servant and his master will stand on equal ground, "without respect of persons." And is it *just* and *equal* that their moral education shall be that of the mules which they drive!—and wherein, in many ten thousand instances, does it excel!!

I was glad to learn from gentlemen of extensive opportunities, planters who own many slaves, that the prejudice is unfounded—that 'the more ignorant the Negro, the better the slave.' The more observant, and those who have both sorts, depose that *the best servants are always found amongst the most intelligent and the most enlightened in the principles of Christianity*. Such has always been my theory; and I am, from still more extended inquiry and observation, the more confirmed that it is true.

Northern abolitionists and all theoretic amalgamators are entirely at fault in much of their reasonings upon the institutions of the South. If they would confine themselves to a single point—to the abolition of the slave trade, to the non-importation of Africans into the South—I can assure them, if they will take my word for it, from all that I have seen in Georgia and the Carolinas, that such is the bleaching, whitening influence of the southern sun and soil, that in less than two centuries the Negroes of the South will have turned as *white* as themselves of the North; and all legislation on *color* will have become as obsolete as the blue laws of Connecticut, or the Berlin and Milan Decrees of the age of Napoleon. Let those gentlemen, then, save their time and money for domestic purposes; and leave us of the South to mind our own business, and wait on the teachings and doings of that great innovator and amalgamator, *Time*.

Quamvis ille Niger; quamvis tu candidus esses.
O formose puer; nimium ne crede colori:
Alba ligustra cadunt, vaccinia Nigra leguntur.
Virgil's Pastoral Songs

At Blackville, Barnwell District, we learned that our kind brethren Dr. Erwin, of Erwinton, and J. M. Barnes, of Evergreen, Anderson District, had passed the day before in the rail cars to Charleston, to meet us and accompany us to the interior. Sorry that we had left Charleston without knowing that they were then in the city, we concluded to wait for their return to Barnwell. We had written to them our intention of being in Charleston on the 20th of November, but did not arrive till the 22d. This failure occasioned that disappointment. Fortunately, without knowing it, we had taken our passage to the right place, and on the next day they found us on their return. Brother Dr. Williams, of Greenville, had also heard of our expected arrival; and though 250 miles distant, he also hasted to Charleston, and finding the brethren Barnes and Erwin, returned with them to Barnwell, where we were introduced to one another. If the brethren in Rome are reported to have gone out to meet Paul as far as Apii Forum and the Three Taverns, in commendation of the truth which Paul preached; deserves it not to be told that these brethren travelled from more than one hundred to two hundred and fifty miles to meet one whom they believed to proclaim and teach the same gospel! With these I ought also to include the much beloved Ephraim Smith, who, though not present with them, had also come from a point equi-distant; but as his manner is, deeming it rather expedient for him to make preparations for our labors in another quarter, always preferring what is most useful to what is merely agreeable, he met us at sister Tubman's in Augusta, Georgia. We "thanked God and took courage," as we had passed over five hundred miles in such haste as not to see a brother

From Blackville we went to Augusta, and there commenced our southern operations. Meanwhile, the Savannah Baptist Association was on the Carolina side of the river in session; and, in the true spirit of sectarian hospitality, voted that all the meeting-houses in the bounds of their denomination should be shut against me. The Reverend *Colonel* Brooks, as we learned, had the honor of moving said resolution, without any other preamble than that he hoped some other persons present would give a reason for it—for he had none to give. Having heard me speak in Augusta, he was asked what he had to say against the doctrine? 'Nothing,' he replied, 'so far as he had heard, was censurable.' Others were interrogated to speak from their own knowledge. None could testify against the errorist from any thing known to himself.

Here follows a copy of the Decree, which has just fallen into my hands, from the Charleston "Index" of November last:—

"SAVANNAH RIVER ASSOCIATION.

"The following extract from the Minutes of the Savannah River Association, at its session in November, 1838, has been sent us for insertion:—

'Brother I. Brooks introduced the following Preamble and Resolutions, which were unanimously adopted:—

'WHEREAS we are required by the Word of God to mark them that cause *divisions* amongst us, and keep aloof from them; and whereas A. Campbell, of Virginia, is notorious

for producing *strife*, *division*, and *confusion* among the Regular Baptist Churches, wherever his doctrines have been countenanced; and whereas the said Alexander Campbell is now making a tour through our community for the purpose of propagating his peculiar views among our people—

'*Be it therefore resolved*, That we caution the churches of this Association to be guarded against the erroneous doctrines usually known as "Campbellism," and that we think it contrary to the best interests of divine truth to open their houses of worship to Mr. Campbell or his disciples, and advise them to act accordingly.

'*Resolved*, That copies of this Preamble and Resolution be forwarded to the Biblical Recorder, Christian Watchman, and the Christian Index for publication.'

If there be error or falsehood in the preamble, or in the premises, it may generally be found in a new dress in the conclusion. In the preceding preamble, for as many times as we find "*whereas*," so often find we an error or a falsehood.

In the first place—the first *whereas* interpolates a new text into the New Testament. From Genesis to the Apocalypse there is no such verse or saying, "Mark those that cause divisions amongst you, and keep aloof from them." Such a verse would have condemned all the Prophets, all the Apostles, and Jesus Christ himself, who made many divisions among the people. Jesus came to make divisions—to send the sword of truth into the world—to separate, "in one family, three against two, and two against three." Shall we, then, avoid and keep aloof from Jesus Christ and the Twelve Apostles! Certainly we must, if *Elder—Colonel* Brooks and the Savannah River Association be fair exponents of the New Testament; or if the text they propose be inserted in the Bible. George Whitfield once read from Paul, as a text, these words—"I can do all things." "I shall stake five pounds you cannot, friend Paul," said Mr. Whitfield! "Stop," replies Paul—"I can do all things—*through Christ which strengthens me.*" "O," says the preacher, "I will not stake five pounds on that, Paul—that is quite another thing." Let the voters for the aforesaid preamble open their Testaments, and read Paul, Rom. xvi. 17. "Now," says Paul, "I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences, *contrary to the doctrine which you have learned, and avoid them.*" Now, according to Paul's words, the Colonel and his friends are to be *avoided;* for they make divisions *contrary* to the Apostle's doctrine. We make divisions *according* to that doctrine, as Jesus and his Apostles did.

The second *whereas* precedes a falsehood; for wherever the teachings of A. Campbell are *countenanced* there is no division: where they are *discountenanced* there is, and ought to be We preach *union* and *truth.* Union and error is a mortal union. Union and truth are one in the bonds of an immortal wedlock. We heal all divisions by the heavenly balm of truth divine and eternal.

The third *whereas* is of the same unfortunate brood of errors, and also precedes a falsehood. How does the Christian and episcopal Colonel know my designs so well as to say, that I make a tour through his community for the purpose of propagating, &c. among *his* people, the Baptists! Truly, the Colonel is a *courageous* man. He draws a bow at a venture, and hazards even truth itself for the sake of "our people." What a man for "our people"! He is mistaken for once. I make no tours among the Baptist community for any purpose, much

less an ignoble purpose! I mingle with, and preach to the whole community; and gain more fruits of my labors *out of*, than in the Baptist community. Now and then, indeed, we meet with an honest conscientious Baptist; and he is sure, on a few hearings, to come out of the community who make divisions *contrary* to the Apostle's doctrine, by putting him out for choosing to obey God rather than man. The Colonel's brethren have now on hands a few jobs of this sort, and they will soon have a hundred more—and they seem resolved on making divisions and offences *contrary* to the teachings of the Apostles.

May the good Lord open the eyes of such blind guides, who forge, without knowing it, both the law and the facts; who invent the text and the case; who make both the Bible and the heretic by one decree!

Will friend Jesse Mercer, of the "Christian Index," publish the above, and send his account to Elder Colonel Brooks; and if he does not pay it, I will? I have written it with my own hand.

The decree and its preamble, with all its terrors, passed. A solitary NO was heard in opposition to it. I believe there were *two nays* only heard in the council that voted Jesus out of all the synagogues in Judea—and then voted him out of the world. They could not find any evil doctrine in him either, if I recollect right; but one very learned Rabbi alleged that whether or not, it was still better for the denomination that one man should be slain, than that the whole party should perish. I had the pleasure to learn, however, that there were some who would have said *no*, if they had only more time or courage. So it was, the decree was passed, and the advisory council legislated contrary to their own constitution on a matter which was not sent up to them from any church, but which they originated among themselves; and on the principle of which, they might have also decreed, or mercifully recommended, that whosoever should receive me into their private dwellings should be cast into a burning fiery furnace, heated with seven Assyrian fires.

Fortunately, however, as in such cases, the measure helped forward the cause. It opened the eyes of many to the true *spirit* of the Baptist sect, and demonstrated that, *as a party*, they were akin to all other proscriptive and denunciatory communities; and that without trial, examination, or proof, they can condemn, denounce, and destroy whom they please, whenever it may subserve the supposed interests of their cause. It created a curiosity to know what the heresy was; and even the preachers themselves, curious to know what it was they had denounced unheard, as well as their hearers, attended many of our meetings, and still imagined and alleged that the evil doctrine was yet untold, and must be kept back from sinister motives.

Meanwhile, we must refer it to the casuists of the day to show the greater criminality of opening a meeting-house, than of opening one's ears to the heresy of New Testamentism. In several places we had a number of those preachers and people to hear us. In one place, indeed, the whole congregation heard us in an adjoining building, while a comfortable meeting-house stood locked within a gun-shot of our stand. Cannot some one satisfactorily explain this problem without the aid of the Papal consecration of logs, brick, and mortar!

A. C.

MONTGOMERY, *Ala.*, January 10th, 1839.

L. C. TODD'S DEFENCE.

Messrs. CAMPBELL & SKINNER:

Dear Brethren—I beg of you to pause in your wordy battle, and let me step in between you one moment, and speak to your readers. This justice I hope you will do me, because you have brought me forward from my obscurity, and exhibited me to the public, each as would best accord with his own feelings; and as none can settle this point but myself.—No man was ever more misrepresented than the writer of this article. In a short journey to the East, last Fall, I was every where interrogated. Some had heard I had become a teacher of Infidelity; some, that I was a Methodist; some, that I was a Campbellite; some, that I was preaching Universalism again; and others, that I was soon going to do it! If such misrepresentations abound while I live, I apprehend much worse treatment, should I die, would follow. To correct *some few* such errors is my only object in wishing to interrupt the *harmony* of your debate. When I made the renunciation my temporal prosperity was greater than usual; but my *mind* was involved in trials which can only be known by experience. My moral sensibilities had become uncommonly and unnaturally acute. And I verily believed God was working in me to bring about the renunciation.—This I have since thought was a mistake.—My feelings would then lead me to direct all my powers against vice, without regard to any doctrine. The Methodist preachers who visited me appeared to be actuated by similar feelings, and thought if I were to become acquainted with their denomination I should be suited with them. Accordingly an arrangement was made with the Presiding Elder that I should go and preach for them till I became satisfied; and then take ecclesiastical fellowship, or not, as I and the brethren should choose. I preached for them a few months *practical religion*, and never alluded publicly to Universalism or any other sectarian notion but twice, and then by urgent request I was not a Methodist, and retired from public life. This is the reason that you both got the impression that I had been a Methodist, which was not the fact. A Universalist paper, at Pittsburg, sometime since stated that while with the Methodists I devoted my whole strength to preaching down Universalism and abusing Universalists. But the truth was, my preaching was generally as well attended and as well approved by Universalists as by Methodists. You, brother Skinner, appeal to me that you never have abused me. I answer, I believed you did. All you published in your paper about me after my renunciation, appeared to me to have no other object than to prejudice your readers against me; and in this your brethren editorial most cheerfully participated. I have conversed with vast numbers of your readers and friends, including some preachers of your order, who agreed with me that I had been abused; but they generally apologized for you, that you had been misinformed by my enemies. All that appeared to me unnecessary, as in my renunciation, I had avoided all personal reflections, and had only changed my opinion on one speculative point. I still believed man to have been created a *mortal;* that there was no personal devil; no vicarious atonement; no *literal* hell of fire and brimstone; but that the Bible did not teach universal holiness and happiness; and that such opinion, although not injurious to enlightened minds and virtuous dispositions, was not calculated to restrain the ignorant and vicious, or reform the corrupt. This change was the whole amount of my offending. I did not speak of bad Universalists, as you insinuate a *traitor* would do, but admitted many among them of the best and choicest of human kind And at the moment you penned your "*mild strictures*," as you term what appeared to me a most cruel and malignant attack, I felt for you the sincerest and kindest affections of a brother. You have been informed that I regretted my renunciation and the course pursued in that matter. I know it was a great sacrifice of interest and fame. I knew then that it would be, and said so. But I was compelled from convictions of duty to do it It was the most disinterested, self-denying, patriotic act of my life, which you should have applauded, however much you thought me mistaken I felt bound to make a defence: and all the regret I have ever expressed, is, that I used more severity of language toward you than was useful. 1. Because when we are reviled I think we ought not to revile again; and, 2. Because I found your readers

generally gave no weight to your "*mild strictures*," but considered them a kind of *professional finesse*, adopted through policy, and signified nothing. I have found that I still have multitudes of warm and affectionate friends among them; and have conversed with scarcely one that was pleased with your "*mild strictures*." A third reason is, that in referring to a horde of *nothingists*, from whom alone I expected abuse, you mistook me to mean Universalists, and felt something of the spirit of retaliation. And although the misrepresentations coming from those I loved, called forth more tears and anguish of heart than any other affliction I ever experienced, I have felt much inclined to forgive them, as they knew not what they did.

What appears to me, brother Skinner, most uncandid in your reference to me, in your debate with brother Campbell, is your assertion that his extract was from my "*second* renunciation," Now the truth is, I never renounced Universalism before. When young I met with a Universal preacher, of great talents and influence. who urged and coaxed me to preach, although I was not prepared nor qualified. I yielded to persuasion, and delivered four or five discourses; but on reflection, found myself embarrassed with so many difficulties and unsettled questions, that I determined to discontinue public preaching until I could see matters in a clearer light. But my difficulties did not relate to the universalism of the Bible. About that I felt certain, and still professed to be a Universalist, and often contended warmly for it. My mind was some perplexed with doubts whether the Bible was divine revelation or not; but not more so than I have since learned the minds of men of reflection generally to be. I made no renunciation; but professed to be a Universalist, and was as much one after I discontinued preaching, as when Mr. Smith, with a full knowledge of my doubts, set me about it.

To conclude, I will gratify all by avowing what so many seem desirous to know, viz — my present views. I cannot yet, for my life, believe Universalism taught in the Bible. And if I am to be censured for not finding it there, my defence is, that I did not make the Book. I am not a devotee to any sectarian system; but would call myself a *Christian moralist*. The *morals* of the New Testament I conceive to be the essence of all religion worth having. All other matters are subjects of endless controversy. I consider all the ceremonies, creeds, and quarrels of Christians, to be but the dress, the trimmings of religion; and they are too often substituted for religion itself. And I allow all to dress and trim their religion as they please; but I take my own clear. May God bless you both, and give you candor and forbearance enough to finish your debate with honor to yourselves and to Christianity, which would be as much as any reasonable man could ask for.

I would wish to write more, had I room; but wish you both to let this letter be published whenever your controversy is given to the public.

Yours fraternally and respectfully,

L. C. TODD.

THE CONSISTENCY OF INCONSISTENCY.

READER, do not be startled at my paradoxical title. It is not my intention to present you with a logical parable like the "Pseudominos" of the ancient Sophists. "When a man says *I lie*, does *he lie*, or does he not? If he *lies*, he speaks *truth:* if he speaks *truth*, he *lies*." Now I have no such object; but it is rather to contribnte a *mite* toward correcting an abused idea of consistency which prevails in all matters political and religious, social and moral. The politician who changes his views of the safety or expediency of a national bank, is at once branded as "an unprincipled renegade." The duellist, who dares to break caste with "gentlemen," and tramples upon "the laws of honor" by refusing to set himself up as a mark to be shot at, simply to show

that he is not afraid of the whizzing of a bullet, is "*a base-spirited plebeian.*" The religionist, who leaves one party and joins another, is recreant and "unstable in all his ways." Could the duellist see himself in his true light, and discern that it is *sheer* cowardice that prompts him to support this vestige of feudal barbarity, he would sacrifice his notions of consistency as a "gentleman;" and, by exhibiting the courage—the true courage to be called a coward, would thus make himself *truly consistent* with that *character* which he now *falsely affects!!* But it is with religious inconsistency that I am now concerned. In the meantime no one doubts but that multitudes change *sides* without changing their minds. That men are capable of yielding to the basest of motives surely needs no proof in the day in which we live. But if the love of truth prompts me to a certain deed, it would surely be very weak in me to refuse to do the things because my neighbor had done the same things for the love of money. Many a man has sustained the burden of a guilty conscience, and imperiled his eternal all, rather than be sneered at as an *inconsistent* man. One man leaves one denomination and joins another; but for the sake of *consistency*, he affirms that he has not changed his *views* in the least. Another man's pride is such, that, rather than acknowledge himself indebted to a fellow-creature, he affirms that he has learned nothing new in twenty years!! But I assert that the man who can spend twenty years even in the company of *idiots*, and learn nothing important, is himself a downright fool. These notions of consistency are perfect phantoms. To determine that our future selves shall be what our present selves are, is to assume that we are now perfect in knowledge and duty. But what means the word consistent? You will say it is "uniform," "homogeneous," or "all of a piece." Well, with what, then, would we be consistent? With our own frail, ignorant, conceited, passionate selves! or with reason and revelation? I once heard a member of the Methodist society say, 'he intended to live and die a Methodist.' To leave the Methodists would, therefore, be very inconsistent for him. But suppose he had said he was a Methodist solely because he believed they had the truth; he would then be perfectly consistent to leave that society the next day, if convinced of error Is the agriculturalist inconsistent because he rejects the rude implements of his forefathers for the improvements of modern times? What would we think of the man who, for the sake of consistency, should still construct his plough after the model of that of the immortal Cincinnatus? Yet just as absurd are many in their consistency. How loath are we to confess "we have been ignorant," or "we have done wrong." As reasonably might we be ashamed to confess we were once children—helpless infants! Surely it is very inconsistent that we should have *advanced* to maturity!! It is, then, perfectly consistent that we should change—that we should "grow in grace and in knowledge." Sad, indeed, would be our condition if we were not permitted to grow wiser and better. Let it be for men of the world to say in the pride of their hearts, "I have spoken: I cannot retract." Let it be for warriors to say, "I have taken the stand: I cannot go back." But even here I stand reproved; for a military chieftain (the immortal Washington) once said, "I was *wrong* yesterday; but I wish to be *right* to-day." In these two days he was very inconsistent; yet the confession was very consistent with

his general character. What a model of true dignity! How worthy of imitation!

I have been led to the above reflections in general by what I every where see and hear, and in particular by some attempts of some of the brethren of late to terrify brother Campbell by this phantom—quoting from his writings of fifteen years ago, something inconsistent, as they suppose, with some of his present views. Would it not be great injustice to deny brother Campbell the privilege of increasing in knowledge, in faith, and love. But I shall, perhaps, be asked, "Is the truth of the Bible so obscure as to preclude the idea of arriving at certainty? Are we to be "ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth"? I answer, Every thing connected with our duty, or happiness as individuals, depends on the plain commands of the Lord, and are adapted to the understandings of children; but there are many things of importance in their place, of which our views depend upon our own reasonings; and as to these we may change our minds *somewhat* as often as we think upon them. The Burman adage does no great injustice to us in affirming, "The understanding of man is darkened—he reasons, and is deceived." But I must here beg leave to introduce the language of another—it is the language of self-defence:—

"Every intelligent creature must change his sentiments, more or less, if he be industrious, enterprizing, and holy. Milton compares growth in knowledge to climbing up a steep ascent. Now, when we ascend a mountain our horizon is momently enlarging; of course our views are continually altering. So, in proportion as we make advancements in knowledge, our former opinions are enlarged, modified, and corrected, or abandoned as truth may direct. The inhabitants of heaven, doubtless, often have occasion to change their views; for, otherwise, how could there be progressive improvement in heaven? Heaven is a world of ever-enlarging intelligence, of affections forever increasing, and of conduct ever refining towards perfection. In that bright and better world every day they are favored with stronger optics, rise to greater heights, and look to more distant objects. There, I suppose, is a great deal of deep and sharp thinking. Created minds, however profound and discriminating, cannot think much without changing their opinions, more or less." Immutability is an attribute belonging only to the uncreated Jehovah. He says of himself, "I am the Lord: I change not." And the magic Seer, "whose eyes were enlightened," said, "He is not *man*, that he should repent," (or change his mind.) But for us, who "see as through a glass darkly"—who "know only in part," what humility becomes us! Let us not arrogate to ourselves *high things;* but let us confess our errors and our ignorance—let us reform and reform until we are made fit for that blissful state, "where we shall see as we are seen, and know as we are known."

CHRISTIANOS.

EDUCATION.

Mr. Editor:

Sir—I send you for publication, a letter entire, from Mr. Charles Cassedy—I think proper to publish it without consulting the author.—Mr. Cassedy is known to be a gentleman of the highest order of talents

His mode of thinking is bold and original; and his style energetic and expressive in a manner peculiar to himself. The mind of Mr. Cassedy is free and untrammelled. He views trite subjects *de novo*, under a clear sky and a blazing sun. Things appear to him as they are—not as others report them to be. Please publish his letter in your best type.———Respectfully,

W. TROUSDALE.

Editor of "The Union."

CRAGFONT, November 25th, 1838.

My dear Sir—WHEN I came to Gallatin from Franklin, a short time since, I was greatly in hopes to have seen both Major Boyers and yourself, on business of some importance to my own pecuniary interests. In my absence from this country, I wrote or rather completed a SCHOOL BOOK, pronounced, if not by better judges than myself, at least by those presumed to be more *impartial*, of a new character—the motto of which will show you, at once, its spirit and intentions:—"*A mere knowledge of words, without a correct understanding of their true meaning, amounts to nothing but* ACQUIRED IGNORANCE."

I have long been convinced that nearly the whole system of American *primary* education is radically wrong. I think the *dead languages*, Latin and Greek, which have been dead indeed for ages, now that the best works in both tongues have been ably and accurately translated, are no longer necessary: the fact is, they never were, as has been pretended, necessary to understanding the English; because, as I have proved in the work alluded to, all the words of one syllable in the English are derived, not from the Greeks and Romans, but from the ANGLO-SAXONS. If you will furnish yourself with a good copy of Bailey's Dictionary, first or second edition, you will there see that the *true roots* of our language are the *old words* of the Saxons, who conquered Britain at an early period, and intermarried with those Britons, (now the Welsh,) and never left the country. The Romans, who once conquered the low countries of Britain, kept possession but a short time; not long enough to spread their language—and the final disruption of the great Roman empire, which fell to pieces about this period, and in consequence of the vast extension of its conquests, and the corruptions and other rottennesses which pervaded the heart of that empire, in the "*eternal city*" itself, withdrew the Romans finally from the country:—in truth, there are no vestiges of these conquering marauders to be found there, even by the best and most *cat-like* antiquarian research, but a few scarcely visible Roman roads.

I am aware that these doctrines, respecting our language and its true origin, are not only new—but that they will startle the prejudices of many worthy and truly learned men, whose courses of education have been such, as to imbue their minds with a *veneration* for the Greek and Latin languages, to which they are not *now* entitled. The time, indeed, has been, but it has long since passed into the tide of eternity gone by, when these languages were not merely of use to mankind, but essential to the civilization and improvement of our species. We are indebted to them for the NEW TESTAMENT, without which, and its influence in taming and subduing the native and stubborn ferocity of man, we would probably now have been without government, morality, or laws—roaming the forests in savage nudity in quest of food, or engaged in petty and exterminating wars for plunder and rapine! But, sir, acknowledging the benefits these languages have conferred on mankind, how many individuals out of the vast population of civilized Europe and America, to say nothing of the great continents of Africa and Asia, where they now and ever have been unknown, can read those sacred writings in their *original languages!* In other words, and by a more forcible and extended exemplification, how many out of the whole population of the globe, *eleven hundred millions of people*, know any thing about them, or have ever heard of their existence? And, to conclude this part of my subject, are

not the religious *missionaries*, delegated to spread the truth of the gospel among distant and savage nations, compelled to learn the languages of those nations before they can succeed in enlightening these heathen and benighted regions? The whole doctrine of languages, then, is reduced to this simple proposition;—Either the whole human race must be taught *one language*, for the diffusion of knowledge, virtue, religion, and civilization—or the *one needful language* must be translated into the different dialects of mankind. Now, sir, which would be the easier of the two achievements? Is not the one as perfectly *impossible*, as the other is *easily practicable*? And, if the Latin and Greek languages are not essential to those nations, and they are many and diversified, who know nothing respecting them, can they be essential to us, the vast majority of whom know as little about them, and understand nothing but English, and some of us hardly that?

If we must have foreign languages, let them not be *dead ones:* translations from them, as they always have done, will answer our purposes. Even the Greeks of the present day cannot understand Homer and Demosthenes—nor can the people of Rome, or the inhabitants of Italy generally, understand the language of Cicero, and their other great writers of antiquity: and if the primitive languages of these once great nations are not essential to their direct and lineal posterity, how comes it that they are so vastly important to us, who are descended from an entirely different race? The living languages, sir, and not the dead ones, ought to be inculcated in our seminaries of learning; and that they are not, is one among the many other great faults of American education. For the purposes of *commerce*, and the interests of AGRICULTURE, its great basis, the living languages alone are essential and sufficient, and ought to be taught in our schools; and even then, only the languages of those nations with whom we have commercial relations.—The activity and vast extension of our commerce, supported as it is by an exhaustless fertility of soil, and an enterprize commensurate with human genius itself, would require many thousands of our citizens to be acquainted with the present languages of the day —How preposterous, then, to exclude them from our schools; and that, too, to make way for languages which have been defunct and useless for ages; or, if ever used, only employed to speculate on the idle and monkish superstitions of antiquity, or the besotted bigotry and intolerance of former days. A knowledge of the Latin and Greek may possibly, and even that is a very doubtful case, lend some assistance to the Lawyer, the Physician, and the Divine: but, sir, how many of our citizens, out of a population of many millions, belong to these classes? And, how many even among these classes, know any thing of the Latin and Greek?

The true policy of American education ought to embrace the GREAT MASS OF THE PEOPLE: it ought to extend to agriculture, to commerce, to the arts—and to the *sciences*, so far as they tend to cultivate and humanize the mind, and to strengthen and support its energies, under the pressure of adversity and misfortune. Education, in this country, ought to be directed to the condition and improvement of the great mass of the people, because here, and here alone, the will of the people constitutes the basis of the government, the laws, and even the policy of our institutions: in truth, the government of this republic can alone be perpetuated by rendering the great body of the people sufficiently intelligent and virtuous to govern themselves. The privileged classes, by which I mean the *wealthy*, can educate themselves in any manner they may please, and at any expense: it is not so with the great popular mass—and it is, therefore, that the means of education ought to be brought to their very doors: they ought not, sir, if it could possibly be avoided, be put to the expense of educating their children *from home*.

The work I have written is on a simple plan: it comprises all the words in our language, in common use, alphabetically arranged, from words of one syllable upward, with the *plain meaning* annexed to each word; so that when the word is learned by the student, the *meaning* is associated with it *forever* in the memory—and this policy accounts for the motto of the book, which I have given you. The reading lessons are all original, and written so as to suit the *improving* capacity of the learner: and relate entirely to our own country and its government, embracing the period between the discovery of America and the adoption of the Articles of Confederation. Every thing foreign is

excluded; and upon this principle, we have always began at the WRONG END of education: we have taught our children, or rather learned them to *imagine*, every thing about foreign countries; when, probably, at the conclusion of their *learned course*, they could scarcely tell you the name of the next county to them. Is not this ludicrous beyond description? Is it not perfectly absurd? Education ought to follow in the footsteps of what we see in nature: it ought to commence with a knowledge of the objects nearest to us, and extend itself with the improving and extending capacities of the mind: we see this proved in the growth of humanity—from the infant at the breast, to the Newtons and Galileoes, who could trace the philosophy of the planetary system. It is a farce, sir. to cultivate the *imaginations* of children, at the expense of their *understanding*. Whenever understanding ends, imagination begins: speak to a child about the house he inhabits and the immediate objects around him, and he can understand you—speak to him of the East Indies, and he begins to *imagine* all about them; and perhaps finally imagines himself into an ignorance of them, which adheres to his mind through life. Two-thirds—three-fourths of the education now given to the American youth, is not merely useless, but entirely *imaginative*. This is proved by the fact, that most of our truly great and useful men are measurably uneducated—or have educated themselves:—and the reason of their vast superiority simply is, because NATURE and experience of the *realities of things* have taught them the wisdom not to be found elsewhere. A knowledge of things, such as they really are—and not such as we merely imagine them, is the true basis of useful wisdom.

The Americans, as a nation, are remarkable for *practical wisdom:* this is evident to every observant and reflecting mind, however the Europeans may slander and ridicule us. The reasons are obvious: here the human mind is left free to act, in obedience to its own strong and unfettered impulses, and the field of experiment and enterprize, is as unlimited as the genius of the people. These are the reasons we excel them in government, in laws founded on experience, in the arts of civilized life, in arms by sea and land; in fact, in every thing but the manufacture of *gewgaws*, and in *pin* and *button*-making!—The genius of our people is not confined to the attainment of trivial objects; it is as free to act as the winds of heaven are to blow—and hence we possess, *as a people*, an inventive genius unknown to the Old World, and have ceased to be what they remain, the mere *drudges* of handicrafts, and the very *asses* of the mechanic arts. In Europe, their *very learned men* are learned to useless purposes, or are merely used by governments to oppress and grind the people; hence their Peers of the Realm, their Archbishops, their Bishops, their innumerable Clergy, and their gorbellied Monks and Friars without number: whilst here, our *very learned men* must be practically useful to the people, and subserve the true interests of a government which belongs exclusively to the people; or they either pass for nothing—or are left to starve in neglect and obscurity. To advance and improve the American national character, a profound knowledge of language is necessary; I mean the language we speak, and that on which our best literary and political works are written, and THAT ALONE. The acquisition of the dead languages may gratify the pride or vanity of the few; but the few are not the great body of our population, to whom their acquisition would be entirely useless. But how, you may ask, is this knowledge to be taught—and how is it to be acquired by students? I answer, Employ preceptors acquainted with the true meaning of every word in your language, and let the simple maxim be,—Attend, that you may understand; and understand, that you may remember. This maxim includes the whole policy of teaching with effect. The understanding is the true parent of the memory; and what is but indistinctly understood, will not long be remembered; this I believe to be the real reason why men of strong and accurate perceptions of meaning, have always powerful and retentive memories—and also the reason why persons of dull apprehension are as notoriously devoid of that great power of memory, which we call *genius*. There is a keenness and quickness of apprehension, observable in the countenances and even gestures of men of true genius, possessed perhaps by no other class of individuals; and it is on this quality, and on the *attention* they are capable of exercising in investigating and understanding a subject, that their memories are based. All men possess these qualities by nature, in a greater or less degree—and even where they are naturally

weak, I believe they may be cultivated, strengthened, and greatly expanded. Such are some of my views, and but a few of them, on the subject of Education. The book I have mentioned to you developes them more fully: and I have ordered it to be sent to Major Boyers and yourself for inspection, in order, if practicable, an arrangement may be made at Gallatin for its publication, on an extensive and continued scale.

Please lay this communication before the Major; and accept, sir, assurances of my unfeigned respect, &c. CHARLES CASSEDY.

Gen. WILLIAM TROUSDALE, Gallatin, Tenn.

CHRISTIANS AMONG THE SECTS—*No. I.*

HILLSBOROUGH, King & Queen, January 2, 1839.

Brother Campbell,

Dear Sir—In the December number of the last volume of your Harbinger, I find a decent and intelligent, and, if I understand his object, an ingenious writer, under the signature of "Christianos." His caption is, "Christians among the Sects." His inquiries are, "What is truth?" "What is truth with respect to Christian character?" and "Who is the Christian?" I do most cordially agree with him that such are "*the most important inquiries ever made by man;*" and I am anxious to take a ride in your vehicle, with this writer, in search of proper answers to these queries. I hope this friend, as we are both in quest of the same things, will have no objection to my doing so, provided I behave myself well. I may now and then remind him of any neglect in attending to the *Author of Truth*, the *persons* spoken to, and the *subject matter* spoken of, for without we attend to these things, we shall search in vain—we shall deceive ourselves. I will first inquire if it is *revealed truth* he is in search of? If so, the "*field*" has its *limits;* consequently cannot be "boundless." If it is "the *truth* of the gospel" that is the object of his inquiry; then, if we be honest and diligent, we certainly shall be able to come to the knowledge of it, notwithstanding an inspired Apostle has expressly informed us there were some "*ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.*" But why? Because they *would not* learn their lessons *in* "*the Book of Life,*" which is "*able to make wise unto salvation through faith that is in Christ Jesus.*" I appeal to the 'sincerity' of "Christianos," if this is not the principal cause of the ignorance among the professors of Christianity, of "what is truth"—"the Christian character"—"who is the Chriatian." Is it not owing to their taking their lessons from uninspired men, and not from Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit? If this be the fact, then a knowledge of *revealed truth*, as spoken by *Jesus Christ* and his *Apostles*—to *whom spoken*—and for *what purpose*, "involves (as Christianos says) every thing dear to us in time and eternity."

But some *libertine* will say, Have such men as Mr. Skinner, the cham

pion of Universalism, and Mr. Lynd, the champion of *a special influence, independent of the word of God*, with a numerous host of literary men, whose lives were spent in studying the Bible, been ignorant of proper answers to these queries? If I believe the inspired Apostle, I must say so. Look at the *loose* way in which each of the above champions quotes the scriptures; and tell me, if you can, the *difference* in their *manner* of *coming* to the knowledge of *their* truths. And is not this the conduct of every other sect? Our friend has very lucidly pointed out this *fatal error*. Allow me here to quote his words as proof of my position: "Men often come by their '*sincerity*' in a very DISHONEST and WICKED way, For example, there are many who endure great conflicts in their minds on the subject of baptism. They search the Scriptures day and night—NOT INDEED FOR THE TRUTH; but TO CONFIRM THEM IN ERROR. Their struggles are all like those of father Bunyan's Pliable in the Slough of Despond—'directed towards the side of the slough nearest his old home. So these are striving to get away from WHAT IS MANIFESTLY THE TRUE AND RIGHT WAY. Immersion stares them in the face; but *this they reject*, and seek for something to satisfy their minds that sprinkling '*will do*.' At length they succeed in stifling their convictions of truth—the voice of conscience is hushed—the struggle has ceased—they are perfectly *satisfied* with sprinkling, and exceedingly thankful that this perplexing subject is put to rest with them. Alas for for their tranquility! Conscience will yet speak out in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men's hearts by Jesus Christ according to the gospel." There is not a shadow of doubt in my mind but Christianos speaks the truth; for confessions almost verbatim have been made by some Pedobaptists, and they have been immersed into Jesus Christ.

Will our friend allow me to say, if some satisfy themselves in this way *about sprinkling*, may not others have satisfied themselves upon every other subject agreeably to the desires of the old man, or according to *their* "*views*" of "what is truth," "the Christian character," "who is the Christian?" I can say Christianos has described very clearly how I first became indoctrinated with the theory of Calvin; but I thank my heavenly Father that I have been aroused to the inquiry, and am not *ashamed* nor *afraid* to embrace the *truth*, to whatever consequences it may lead. But I am reminded by the example of Christianos our ride should be short. When opportunity is again afforded I will prosecute our search. Yours most sincerely,

THOMAS M. HENLEY.

CHRISTIANS AMONG THE SECTS—*No. II.*

Brother Campbell,

IT is not "truth in general" that is the object of inquiry with our friend Christianos. He confines himself to *one point*—"*What is truth*

with respect to Christian character? Who is the Christian? Upon a *scriptural* answer to this inquiry depends the destiny of millions. How careful we ought to be to *teach* or say we *believe* any thing *but the exact truth.*" He "sees on one side a disposition to *undervalue* positive ordinances; and on the other side a disposition, equally dangerous, to *overvalue* them."—This is an important fact. It is no common thing to find multitudes who tremble at the thought of believing *too little*, but never dream of believing *too much*. What is it to have a correct faith? *Is it to believe the exact truth?* Is the hazard less on one side than the other? I am pleased to see our friend's notice of this important subject, and do hope he will bear with me in examining his evidence as quoted in his essay.

I shall not notice them all, as this would take up more room than necessary. His inquiry is, "Can an *unimmersed* person be an acceptable worshipper of God?" This *he believes*, and labors to prove; but has failed to produce one example or saying from the *New Testament*. I admit under the first dispensation, that those worshippers whose sins were remitted, not *before confession and offering their sacrifices*, but IN OFFERING THEM, were accepted without immersion. His "obeying in *spirit*, and not in the letter," no Prophet or Apostle has ever taught that such a thing "is equally as acceptable to the Lord as the most *literal obedience.*" This is believing too much. Abraham obeyed to the very *letter*, until he was in the *act of giving the fatal blow to his son, when the voice of God forbade him.* Let him prove as conclusively that the *Pedobaptists* have believed, repented, and gone *into the water* to be immersed, and the voice of God forbids their immersion. We will then, and not until then, admit his caption, "*Christians among the sects;*" or that such are "acceptable worshippers of God." The sayings of the lawyer, no doubt, is an important truth; but, reader, this lawyer, like all *unimmersed* persons, confessing that the immersed penitent believer is a *Christian*, sought to justify himself: see Luke x. 29. His quotation, "to come to the Saviour as the first requirement, then learn of me," is what we contend for. Where can we find the Saviour that we may come to him? I answer, *No where but in his own institutions.* This *mental religion*, that "*is minded to*," but *does not do*, has filled the world with a multitude of disobedient, prayerless, Christless professors. To believe, repent, and be immersed, *is the only scriptural way ordained by the Saviour of coming to him* since he left the earth. Then let us "learn of him" the lessons he and his inspired Apostles have left on record, and DO THEM. *Such is the Christian, and such a course will form the Christian character.* We shall then stand "perfect and complete in all the revealed will of God."

His "general or universal principle" will not bear him out, unless he can prove God has not commanded all men every where to repent, believe, and be immersed; and that these commandments cannot be learned and obeyed by the sons and daughters of men. If they can be *Christians*

through the perversion of baptism, why not Christians without faith and repentance? He that gave one command gave all, and says, "He that believeth not shall be condemned"—"For *whosoever* shall keep the whole law, and yet *offend in "one point, he is guilty of all."* I appeal to Christians if it is not a law of the kingdom of heaven that all men should believe that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God," repent of their sins, and "be immersed for the remission of them;" and whether there is a *shadow* of evidence that *the Apostles* ever recognized any man or woman (that did not *obey his law*) as Christians. No man is required to *immerse himself;* consequently I cannot conceive of any condition a *penitent believer* in these United States can be placed in, while he is alive and can speak, to render *him physically unable to be immersed,* if the teachers and members would do their duty.* If he were to die in the act of immersion, it would only be a glorious exit from time to heaven. The Saviour has promised, "He that *loses* his life for my sake and the gospel's, the same shall *save* it." I knew one who cordially gave up his son, at his earnest request to obey Jesus Christ, when it was believed he would die in the action. He now lives to glorify God for it. "For what is our life? It is even a vapor that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away." But there is "a *crown* of life," which the Lord, the righteous Judge shall give unto all them that love his appearing. And who are those that love his appearing? "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I WILL MANIFEST MYSELF TO HIM." Yes, we must forsake all, or we cannot be his disciples. Our friend's idea of "the heart's being bowed to the *will of God*" is a good one. Let infant sprinkling or pouring, or adult sprinkling and pouring be proved to be the "*will of God,*" and we will admit there are "Christians among the sects." Any man that contends without this—there are such—has to "*forsake* houses, and brethren, and sisters, and father, and mother, and wife, and children, and lands, *for the sake of Jesus.* They must be "converted, and become as little children. Mark it, reader, this text our friend quoted, was spoken by the Saviour to *his disciples,* after Peter had said to him, "*Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.*" This proves the need of the conversion of *all sects.* Then, "*Whosoever receives one such little child in my name, receives me*" What follows? THE SAVIOUR IS AS CERTAINLY REJECTED BY THOSE WHO REFUSE TO RECEIVE every man and woman who believes with their whole heart, (and no moral impediment afterwards,) upon the testimony of the Apostles and Prophets, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, repents of their sins, and are immersed into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as they *receive him,*

* *When the Saviour was on the earth the friends of the palsied, or paralytic, or diseased, hesitated not to carry them on couches to Jesus, through every difficulty. All were made whole.*

when they receive one such little child that believes in him. A word to the wise is enough.

In my next I will endeavor to show that the sects themselves prove their systems cannot be *Christian*, upon their own admission—"Christians among the sects."———Yours as ever,

THOMAS M. HENLEY.

SCEPTICISM.

LETTERS TO A SCEPTIC—*No. I.*

WEST MIDDLETON, November, 1838.

My dear Friend,

YOUR letter came duly to hand I reciprocate all the kind wishes contained in it. We are all in our usual health, except my dear wife, whose health is rapidly declining: thus presenting before me the *desolate* prospect of being soon left alone. But we are all passing away to the land of silence and repose: soon shall we exchange the tumult and bustle of life for the solemn stillness of the tomb: soon shall we exchange all our earthly possessions for the coffin, the winding-sheet, and the grave. Well, I shall soon follow my beloved wife—not into the regions of darkness and oblivion—but to "realms of an eternal day." This is hope—my joyful anticipation! Instead of this, what has the world to give? Compared with this, what are the joys and hopes of unbelief?

"Go ask the Infidel what boon he brings us;
What charm for aching hearts he can reveal,
Sweet as the glorious promise hope sings us;
Earth has no sorrow that Heaven cannot heal!"

Tell me not, my dear friend, of the abuses of this religion; tell me not of the party strifes of professing Christians; neither tell me of the sword and flames of Catholic persecution:

"What is the bigot's torch, the tyrant's chain?
I smile on Death, if heavenward hope remain!"

Consider also, that if this hope at last prove to be like "the baseless fabric of a vision," yet we are as well off as you; we have perilled nothing; for then, indeed, we had nothing lost; and, as Cicero said to the Sceptics of his day, "There will then be no danger of your laughing over our folly and disappointment." But, on the other hand, if we are right, we gain an "eternity of bliss"—and infinite duration can alone unfold your loss!! The Christian, indeed—the man guided by the lamp of eternity, is cheered and gladdened as he passes through this world of sorrow and disappointment—

"And dying triumphs in the Cross,
The antidote of Death!"

To him there is no impenetrable gloom hanging over the grave; the rays of the "Star of Bethlehem" have cheered this prison-house, and

shown him "a vista to the skies." But the lamp of the Sceptic goes *out* at the very place where most of all he needs its aid. When his spirit takes its flight, it is "a leap in the dark" but the Christian enters the grave with a firm and undaunted step; for his Leader has gone there before him, and returned again; and this abode is still warm with life and light from his presence, short as was his stay! So that, although it be not *strictly* according to nature and reason that the *cold grave* should become a mother, more than it was that Sarah, who was ninety years old, should have a son; yet we are, in fact, taught to look upon the grave as our mother!! She will bring forth those begotten by the Eternal Spirit, after the slumbers of a night, invigorated with "immortal youth," and clothed with "glory, honor, and immortality." How triumphantly, then, may we challenge the unbelieving philosopher in the language of the poet—

"The evening star of reason thine,
The Bright, the Morning Star be mine!
Reason may guide to that cold clay,
Where ends the wanderer's earthly way;
But o'er the grave this Star shall rise,
And point the pilgrim to the skies!"

But this, you will say, is not argument. I shall, therefore, proceed to your difficulties. And, first, you say, "I believe, for many reasons, that the Bible is the work of designing men." I can only express regret that you have, in this instance, (like too many religionists,) taken your creed upon trust. This is the stereotyped slander of Paine and Voltaire; and there never was a dogma of the Catholic church received with more implicit faith, than this has been by the Sceptics. A superficial reading of the scriptures, with this question before you, would have convinced you that it was impossible; and a slight acquaintance with the history of priestcraft would have shown you, that the scriptures never answered their purpose. No, sir; the *poor*, the *afflicted*, the *oppressed*, are the special care of the Bible, and of the God of the Bible: whereas the *proud*, the *oppressors*, the *rich*, the *covetous*, are, from Genesis to Revelation, "cursed with a curse." The law of Moses made no provision for the priesthood beyond a bare maintenance; and it was only by "taking away the key of knowledge" from the people, that the priests and expounders of the law gained such wealth and influence in the time of the Saviour of the world. But, to come to later times, when and where did the priests exert the most unlimited influence? Was it not in the "dark ages," in the 10th century, the midnight of Papal darkness? The favorite maxim of this century was, "Ignorance is the mother of devotion;" and mark it well, it was *ignorance of the Bible* that was so highly valued. Priests never *feared* any other light! What was the leading heresy of the Waldenses, for which they were driven from their peaceful homes? It was reading the Bible for themselves, and obeying it. Many, even of their children, could repeat the whole New Testament. Now, according to your supposition, these were the very people that ought to have been most easily brought under clerical domination. But, no; they suffered the loss of all things at their hands, even life itself, in thousands. They were driven from fertile vallies to snow-capt mountains, to fastnesses and glens; but never would they bow the neck to priestly des-

potism. But am I gravely refuting so absurd a charge as this? Where did priests ever seek to gain power, and wealth, and influence by disseminating the light of the Bible? No where—never. They have always had, and still have, most influence where the Bible is kept most from the people. Go to Italy, Spain, Portugal, and inquire if priestly domination is supported there by means of the Bible! Tell me what broke the charm of clerical influence, by which the people had been spell-bound for ages? It was the terrific appeals made to the people by Luther and his coadjutors—"Read your Bibles"—"Examine and think for yourselves"! It was the opening of the "Little Book." It was the diffusion of translations of the scriptures.

What people at this day have the most freedom of thought—the most independence of mind—where the least servile homage is paid to priests? It is in New England, where the Bible has been more read and revered, by young and old, than in any other place on this wide earth. We are this day indebted to this book for every feature of republican liberty that we enjoy. Every item of republicanism was discussed during the session of the "Long Parliament" convened under Charles I. and dissolved by Oliver Cromwell. Never did kingcraft and priestcraft get such an exposure, even from infidels themselves, as from the Puritan members of this Parliament; and the result was, the establishment of republicanism in all its forms.

I shall take up your *strong* objection in my next. In the meantime I shall feel every assurance that, whatever difficulties you may discover in the Bible, you will never again say it is priestcraft.

With sentiments of esteem, I am your friend,

M. S. CLAPP.

[The following Essay was written sometime in May last, and was originally intended for *The Christian Witness*, being a reply to an article in that paper.]

CHRISTIAN UNION.

Dear Brother,

I SEE in your paper of April an article on this subject, containing many useful and excellent hints on this all-important subject; but, at the same time, setting forth certain difficulties which appear to the author insuperable. Most gladly would I lend my hand, my head, my heart, if by any means I could assist in the promotion of so desirable an object, or give the slightest impulse towards a consummation so devoutly to be wished.

The author before me says, "I believe there is a great principle in Protestantism, which, if carried out fully, will accomplish this object. It is this, that 'nothing is to be received as of any authority in matters of religion, but what is plainly taught in the Bible;' yet a difficulty here arises—'Who shall say what part of the holy scriptures are essential to salvation! Where is it said in the Bible, that such and such truths must be believed, in order that men may get to heaven; while another class may be rejected?'

I reply, it is no where said in the scriptures, that one part of them may be rejected; yet we are plainly and emphatically told what parts are "essential to salvation." Our Lord himself says, John xvii. 3. "And this is *life eternal*, that they might *know thee*, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent;" but it is no where said, Whosoever does not believe every word in the Old and New Testament hath not eternal life. Thousands of the first Christians "believed to the salvation of their souls," who probably never saw a *single chapter* of the Old Testament, and but a very small part of the New. Paul affirms that "all scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is *profitable*;" and again, "Whatsoever was written aforetime was written for our learning." Now many a thing may be *useful* and "*profitable*" which is not *necessary*. In temporal things our logicians divide knowledge into necessary, useful, ornamental, and luxurious. Necessary knowledge is thus defined by David Blair: "It is that which simply provides man with food, and with the means of sustaining life." He also says, "Luxurious knowledge includes *abstract inquiries:* as physics, metaphysics, many branches of experimental philosophy, heraldry, antiquity, and the dead languages. If we would look for the perfection of the *physical* man, we must look to the savage state, where *only necessary* knowledge is possessed—where there is nothing liable to *abuse*. What an exemption is there enjoyed from the complicated evils and desires that afflict civilized and enlightened society? Witness the uninterrupted health of the savage—his elasticity and vigor; his eye not dim, even at a hundred years of age! So, also, if we would look for the perfection of the spiritual man, we must go back to the time when only necessary knowledge was enjoyed—before luxurious knowledge had taught us to despise the "primitive simplicity" of those who "rejoiced with joy unspeakable and full of glory." If it be objected, that to require nothing but a simple profession of faith in Christ in order to church membership, would be to open wide the door to heresy; I answer, that the Apostle John wrote his "testimony," or gospel, after he had lived to see heresy like a flood breaking in upon the church: the Gnostic heresy in particular had desolated some of the fairest portions of the church in Asia Minor; yet then he declares, John xx. 30, 31., "And many other signs, truly, did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written that you might *believe* that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that, believing, you might have life through his name." If nothing more was necessary *then*, who shall say more is necessary *now?*

Besides, the attempt that is made in our systems to present a summary of scriptural truth, is subversive of the plainest teach-

ings of the scriptures, and of the dictates of reason and common sense. The scriptures regard the spiritual man in a natural and rational light—as a progressive being, passing from infancy to manhood, and from manhood to age: but our systems make no such distinctions. They present the same truth, in *substance* and in *form*, in *kind* and in *degree*, to the fool and the philosopher, to the infant and the man of grey hairs. But in the primitive church there were the "little children," who had no higher attainment than "the new-born joy of sins forgiven;" there were the "young men, who were strong and had overcome the wicked one;" and there were "the fathers, who had known him from the beginning." See 1 John ii. 12–15. For the little children the Apostles had "*milk*," and for the young men they had "strong meat:" see the last three verses of Hebs. v. Also, for the fathers "perfect in wisdom," they had "the deep things of God:" see 1 Cor. ii. 6–11. Our systems contemplate a church as composed only of *full grown men;* and, in keeping with this view, they only present us with strong food. They have no *milk* for the little children. We gravely assure such that we have no doubt but the *Lord* has received them; but *we cannot*, unless they have *strength* to receive and digest all the strong meat in our creeds.

The scriptures require a "unity of faith," a "unity of the spirit;" and the *bond* by which this unity is to be preserved is "*peace.*" But we will have a unity of *knowledge*, a unity of *opinion*, and the *bond* is *party zeal.* But really would this unity of knowledge and of opinion be desirable? Suppose our Lord had himself given a summary of his doctrine, as possibly he could have done on a single page of the New Testament, what would have been the effect on his people? Verily, most *pernicious!* It would have left us without any sufficient motive to study any other part of the Book. Every one would have committed to memory the summary, and have been contented to remain in profound ignorance of every thing else in the Book. And is not this precisely the effect of our creeds? Do not they cause a woful neglect of the holy scriptures, by pretending to exhibit all that is necessary to be learned in the *Bible?* And do not religious teachers confess the ignorance of their people, when they warn them of the danger of hearing those who differ from them in their views? Could they louder proclaim the little confidence they have in any light they have imparted to them? Whereas, if their minds were enlightened and fortified by a thorough knowledge of the scriptures, they would be proof against all the seductions in the world.

But, alas for the ignorance of the Bible that every where prevails! We are not safe when we hear error, nor yet when we

hear truth; for we may receive the *error*, and reject the *truth!* "This people, that know not the law, are *cursed*," said a Jewish Rabbi; and Chryostom said, "The source of all error is ignorance of the scriptures, the medicine of the soul." Our Lord, therefore, intended that we should learn our religion from the whole Book—from "the Law, from the Prophets, and from the Psalms," as well as from the New Testament—that we should begin as infant learners, and advance until we become "perfect men"—"until we attain to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."

Our Lord says, "The kingdom of heaven is like treasure hid in a field," and he would have men search for it. This is kind, as well as wise in him. We set no value upon those things which cost us neither labor nor research; but how do we prize those things for which we have toiled and sought? But our creeds are intended to save men the trouble of *thinking* or *searching* at all!! Again, we are admonished, "We, then, that are strong, ought to bear the infirmities of the weak;" but we will have no weak ones among us, and then we shall not have their infirmities to bear. The scriptures are given to purify our hearts —our affections—to control our passions, and fit us for heaven; and this they do, not by giving us theory and cold abstractions, but by giving us practical truth—teaching us what we should believe and what we should practise; and this they do by living example. The great difference between the Law and the Gospel is, that the former was a theory, cold and lifeless, "written and engraven on tables of stone;" but in the gospel the same purity is exhibited in the living example of our Lord and Saviour, warm with life and love. Here we are taught that "love is the fulfilling of the law"—love to God and love to man, exhibited in active beneficence, kindness, forbearance, and all goodness. But with us the rage for "sound doctrine" has uprooted "faith, hope, and charity," and left them to wither beneath the burning influence of party jealousy. And what has the church gained by all the speculations, the controversies, and divisions that have been originated since the Protestant Reformation? What have we left us in place of the purity, the benevolence, the love, the bliss of the ancient Christians? Very little, indeed, except the *proud, empty* title, "Orthodox."

The admired author of *Junius' Letters* says, "In the shipwreck of state *trifles float* and are preserved, while every thing that is *solid and valuable* sinks to the bottom and is lost forever." If this has been true of political establishments, how fearfully has been verified in religion! We have been most punctilious in tithing "garden herbs," but have neglected "judgment, mercy, and the love of God." After all, what means this phrase, "sound

doctrine"? The Greek phrase, "*hugianousa didaskalia*," thus translated signifies "doctrine which imparts health;" the qualifying word is a participle, and conveys the idea of an active agency; it is from *hugies*, health, and expresses not so much the *quality* of the doctrine as its *effects*. And here I am in good company; for Dr. George Campbell, of Aberdeen, in his "Lectures on Theology," p. 177, says of this very word, "It is a term which marks not the logical justness of a theory, but its beneficial tendency: it is not the *truth* of any notion which can denominate it *sound*, but the *salutary influence it hath on human life;* that which makes it serve as *food* and *medicine* to the soul." And Chrysostom, as already quoted, calls the scriptures PSUCHES PHARMAKON, "*the medicine of the soul.*" But, above all, does not Paul himself *clearly* give this view of the matter? For when he admonishes Titus, in 2d chap., "But speak thou the things which become sound doctrine," he proceeds to declare in what it consists: "that the aged men be sober, grave, temperate, sound in faith, in love, in patience; that the aged women, likewise, be in behaviour as becometh holiness," &c. "that they teach the young women to be sober, to love their husbands, to love their children; to be discreet, chaste, keepers at home, good, obedient to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed Young men likewise exhort to be sober-minded," or to govern their passions: "in all things showing thyself a pattern of good works." Here, then, is "*sound* (or health giving) doctrine;" and here we are all agreed. As said the immortal William Penn, "The humble, meek, merciful, just, pious, and devout souls are every where of one religion; and when death has taken off the mask they will know one another, though the diverse liveries they now wear make them strangers."

M. S. CLAPP.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

CHRISTIAN UNION.

It appears from the "Union Herald" of the 9th instant, that the Christian Union Convention, out of the proceedings of which we made large extracts in the two precedings numbers of the Harbinger, held its second meeting, according to the appointment of its standing committee, at Cazenovia, on the 30th of January; at which time and place, the Business Committee reported the following resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*, That the regeneration of the candidate constitutes his only and his sufficient title for admission into the visible church; and that this title constitutes the only and the sufficient warrant to receive the candidate.

2. *Resolved*, That the title by which a person enters the visible church, is the only and the sufficient title for his remaining in it; and that whilst, on the one hand, he has no right to his place after his deportment has been such as justly to destroy the belief of his brethren in his regeneration; so, on the other hand, they have no right to deprive him of his place, until such belief is destroyed.

3. *Resolved*, That a church which excludes a member for any change in his faith or practice, that is not fatal to its belief in his regeneration, manifestly finds no warrant for the measure, in the discipline prescribed in the eighteenth chapter of Matthew; for that discipline requires that the discarded member be looked upon as unregenerate—"as a heathen man and a publican."

4. *Resolved*, That, if we exclude from the visible church, any person whom we still believe to be a Christian, we are guilty of the cruelty and blasphemy of holding up a disciple of the Saviour as a heathen man and a publican.

5. Whereas there has been a manifest solicitude on the part of many professed friends of God, that Union men would reveal their PLAN of Union—*Therefore, resolved*, That our PLAN is both simple and primitive, consisting,—1st. In ascertaining, in the light of God's Bible, what constitutes Christian character. 2d. In extending the hand of Christian and church fellowship to all who sustain that character. 3d. In relinquishing, forthwith, every principle or practice which tends to proscribe this universal Christian fellowship.

6. *Resolved*, That the Holy Bible is the only authorized rule of religious faith and practice; therefore, for the church or any portion of it, to assume the prerogative to substitute any other rule in the place of the Inspired Volume, is an assumption of power, which is, in its results, dishonorable to God, and of dangerous tendency to the church of the Lord Jesus.

After much discussion, during five sessions of the convention, on the 30th and 31st ult., the above resolutions were adopted with some slight alterations. In the 1st. "the new birth spoken of by Jesus Christ to Nicodemus;" instead of "the regeneration of the candidate." And also in the 2d, 3d, and 4th, so as to make them correspond with the first, thus amended. In resolution 5th, instead of "extending the hand of Christian (*and*) church fellowship it is (*or*) church fellowship; thus destroying the sectarian distinction between Christian and Church fellowship. The 6th was adopted without any amendment. During the course of discussion respecting the eligibility and relevancy of the above propositions for the promotion and maintenance of CHRISTIAN UNION, much solid argument and sound reasoning were exhibited, of which we make the following extracts:—

Brother Pool objected to the resolution, as being based upon the principle, that subsequent to the regeneration of an individual, an act of the church was necessary to constitute him a member. It was argued that the Head of the church had no where in the scriptures delegated such power—that it was assumed—and that this assumption was

the root of all the sectarianism in the church. The power to receive into, involved the power to shut out of; and not only to shut out of, but to cast out of. [Hence the whole value which an individual placed upon his standing in the church, and the participation in the ordinances of the gospel, strengthened by his fear of disobeying the Saviour, in causing divisions, would be a rod, waved *in terrorem* over his head, by a corrupt majority, to warn him against any acts of duty which might disturb their guilty consciences, or effect injuriously their selfish interests! Add to this the duty of belonging to the church, and what a bribe to compromise with sin!! Does divine legislation embody such a principle?]

Brother Goodell. This resolution contains the great principle for which those who advocate the cause of Christian union contend.—There is one difficulty, however, attending the discussion of this principle, which attends many others—it is so clear that it cannot be made clearer by argument. There are several things, however, which are not involved in it, which I will mention:—

1. It does not involve that there is no outward, visible, church organizations. It supposes a church which is to exercise the right of receiving members.

2. It does not imply that the church do not possess the right to exercise their best judgment whether the applicant be a Christian. It has been opposed because of such implication.

It is the duty of all to exercise their judgment of the import of the scriptures of divine truth. The Saviour says if any man will receive his word, he shall know of the doctrine. All men should be theological students. They should study the Bible for themselves, and not receive their doctrines from the D. D's. and the creeds. If all would give themselves to the study of the Bible and prayer, there would be a greater unanimity of sentiment and opinion in the whole body of Christians, than there is now in any one denomination of Christians. There is a fear on the part of some that the tendency of Union principles is to lower down the standard of theological knowledge. They fear there will be no study of the Bible. But the object of the advocates of Union is to get all men to search the scriptures, to take directly thence their religious opinions, and not take them second-handed from others. In the present state of things, it is considered no evidence a man is not a Christian, to be excluded from the church. But adopt the principle of this resolution, and the case will be materially changed. Then what a powerful motive it will be for a man to examine himself, to see whether he be in the faith. So far from making a loose state of things, it implies all that is contended for. We would not only have a standard, but a high one, It must be almost *immeasurably raised.* But, if I am not mistaken, a man may now be received with very defective evidence.

The principle involved in this resolution is, that the church organized shall receive all who give evidence they are Christians. It does not say where the standard shall be placed; but, when placed, they are to judge by it, and receive or reject accordingly. It seems so plain, as hardly to need argument.

The evils of sectarianism have long been deprecated; but when the finger is placed upon the point, then there is a question about it. I

have admitted there might be a mistake in regard to applicants, when acting upon the principle of this resolution; but it seems hardly possible. The church is a city set on a hill; it *is*, not *ought* to be—a light to the *world;* and if it be a light to the world, cannot Christians be known to each other?

Brother Smith. I shall not say much in defence of the principle contained in the resolution; but briefly reply to some principal objections. It is clear that the church should be one—the seamless garment of Christ should be emblematic of it. The figures of the scriptures denote her oneness—look at the vine—Christ the vine, his children the branches. The human body—Christ the head, his children the members.

Obj. Your plan will not effect the object. Nothing but holiness of heart will produce a union of Christians. Admit it. But if nothing but holiness will produce union, says the objector, why try to bring such discordant materials together? Why not labor to have men holy, and they will come together? *Ans.* Because God commands us to be united; and the way to be holy is to obey all God's commandments. The way to make men Christians, is to prevail upon them to cease from every sin, and cordially obey every command.

Many mistake in supposing we wish to bring the various denominations together with all their predilections and sectarian jealousies. No: we wish them to give them up, to repent in sackcloth and ashes for their sins, and offer up all their party interests and sectarian prejudices a willing sacrifice on the sacred altar of a common Christianity.—Suppose I see brethren quarrelling, and I wish to set them at one again, shall I tell them to go asunder, each one to your own "home," as all the sects do? Is this the way to produce love and union between them? No! But, brethren, you must be united—you all belong to one family—have one Father—one Redeemer died to save you—you have one eternal home—one common interest—how can you otherwise than love one another? Suppose the same rule applied to the marriage relation; and to every couple when there was any dissatisfaction, it should be said, Go asunder whenever you think you can better yourselves. And is that relation more near than the relation of Christians to Christ and to each other?

2. But it is said, there are causes of dissension enough in the church now, and why produce more?

Many set peace above purity: the Bible does not. First *pure*, then peaceable, says the Word—we must pursue purity, and never sacrifice it to peace—never compromise with any sin for any consideration whatever.

3. But the Union Church opens its doors to all, and will admit impostors.

Well, but are not all churches liable to the same objection? Do they not all admit impostors? [All who are brought up with a Christian education adopt some religious principles; and is a Calvinistic church any more guarded against imposition by an impenitent sinner holding Calvinistic doctrines, or an Arminian church against one holding Arminian sentiments, than a Union church against one embracing Union principles? If other churches can detect the absence of Christian experience, or the spirit of Christ, cannot we?]

4. But you propose to give up written creeds.

Very well: we must do so to carry out our principles. The resolution supposes the church to judge of the piety of the candidate by their present opinion of the Bible standard. Suppose some generations ago a creed was formed, fairly expressing the views of the church. Opinions change in the community—the church sympathises with the community, and their opinions change. Now the creed does not express their views. You all understand the 17th of the 39 articles of the Episcopal Church.

Again, I have another objection to creeds. They supersede the necessity of the present members of the church examining the Bible conditions of membership. It is putting the duty on a few, while we have nothing to do ourselves; and the consequence is, we become dwarfish, shrivelled Christians; and those to whom we delegate the power and the duty, become bloated Popes.

Brother Scofield was glad to see organization advocated by so prominent a member of the Convention; but cannot reconcile organization with this one-eyed principle. I have some objections to the resolution. 1st. It excludes baptism. There is no entrance into the kingdom of heaven, but by baptism: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." The practice of baptism was universal in the primitive church. The Apostles administered it immediately after conversion. No one was admitted to the church without it.

Brother Brewster. The principle of Christianity is love. A new commandment I give unto you, says the Saviour, that ye love one another. It is the duty of the church to refrain from any thing that militates against it. Does sectarianism make men love each other more by separating them, and placing them at a distance? How ministers caution their hearers against hearing other ministers preach! How they labor to destroy the influence of ministers of different sentiments! Is that calculated to make Christians love one another? I believe the bitterest hatred in the world is felt by rivals on religious subjects.

Jesus came into the world to destroy selfishness; but the division of the church into parties, having separate and opposing interests, is directly culoulated to foster it. In almost every village there are several churches, laboring to sustain each a minister, where they are hardly able to sustain one. One can be built up only at the expense of the others, or by taking from the common stock; and thus depriving the others of the opportunity.

Christians are the stewards of God; and shall we squander property profligately? Suppose all Christians should adopt this resolution, what a supply of ministers could be afforded for the destitute places of the earth! A large proportion of the ministers of this state, and of the United States, could be spared to go and proclaim the gospel to heathen nations, and not only not leave any destitute, but leave the people of their charge better supplied. One minister in a village, where there are now two, three, or four. could be well supported, the church would walk together in love, and be able to give liberally to objects of charity and benevolence. Brethren, we are not left discretionary in this matter; we are bound by the law of Christ to adopt such a course of conduct.

It has been said it will bring those of different sentiments together—and why should they not come together? We are all of the same household, of the same family—we are brethren. And shall we, because of a little difference in opinion, separate from each other, with hatred in our breasts? It has been said, also, that bringing together those of different sentiments tends to animosity. It is not so. Were it not for these sectarian divisions there would be no motive for controversy: there would be nothing to be gained by it. Who ever heard of a bitter controversy on any point of doctrine, that was not embodied in some sectarian creed—that was not made somewhere a test of fellowship? O! this sectarianism is draining the church of love!

Brother Jackson. Union with Christ, or the new birth, is a sufficient title to Christian fellowship. Christ has left his example, and commanded us to follow in his steps. A living faith in Christ is the condition or instrument of union to Christ; and it should be to all Christians. This is the basis of the union. He has a church in the world. It is a visible church. Its object is, to make all men Christians; and it should embody none but such. If a man comes into the church a sinner, he comes in in the habiliments of a Christian; if he comes in a devil, he must enter clad in the robes of an angel of light.

What constitutes a church? It is a body of believers; and should be organized on a principle that shall not conflict with the liberty or individual rights of any Christian. Christ is the legislator. He calls *me* to pursue a certain course as an individual; and any requirement of the church, which conflicts with it, is wrong, and shows the foundation to be rotten. Man naturally seeks and aspires after knowledge—God commands him to pursue it; and the right to do so cannot be taken from him. Christianity takes no right from him; on the contrary, it places him in a new field, where his immortal powers have a freer and wider scope. This is the reason for which God turned him from darkness to light.

Is a church, organized on a principle conflicting with individual Christian rights, on a Bible principle? Suppose I ask admission to some church, and believe all the articles of their creed, and am received, I pledge myself to the church. In obedience to God I "search the scriptures," and pursue after knowledge. In the pursuit after truth the Holy Spirit pours his floods of light into my soul, and the Divine Word seems a new book. New truths open themselves to my mind, and I find that some of my former opinions were wrong. I have obeyed God—I have sought—I have found—and what is the consequence? I must walk out at the door? Can the church be right, I ask, in her foundation? Christ is still my head—I am a member of his body—and what right have my brethren to do to me that I have not to do to them? Many in error does not make it right. My Christian rights arise from my faith in Christ—theirs arise from their faith; and they have no more right to excommunicate me, than I have to excommunicate them. I hope soon the question will be discussed, "What constitutes Christian character?" Now, an orthodox belief and good moral conduct, will secure a man a standing in the church; but the test should be, "living like Christ." One thing cheers me—it is, Truth will prevail. If I have the truth, have the light, and walk in the light, it matters very little that I am judged of man's judgment.

The 5th resolution coming up, brother Goodell remarked, this resolution asserts the duty of ascertaining the Bible standard of Christian character. It has been supposed that the advocates of union wish to throw open the church to almost all who are of a moral character. At the last Convention it was said that this was not the object, but to settle the principle contained in the first resolution. But the standard of Christian character should be ascertained. There is now a great diversity of opinion on this subject; but there should be a uniformity. The community are looking out to see what ground Union men are taking—whether they will receive any thing or any body. God has given injunctions and rules enjoining the duty, and it is a matter of the first importance to the cause of union, that there be an understanding among us what is the standard of Christian character.

Brother Myrick. There is one point to which I wish to call attention. The resolution requires that we relinquish *forthwith* whatever tends to sectarian distinctions. That means, to do it immediately. It will do no good to pass resolutions, unless we act accordingly, and carry them out.

The 6th resolution was then read.

Brother Goodell. The principle contained in this resolution is recognized by all Protestant creeds, but they practise differently. After adopting an article embracing this principle, they go on and adopt many others. It may be asked, What is the difference between those articles and the resolutions of this Convention? I answer, The difference is, they are made by a few, and imposed on the many. Instead of arguing the several points before the common people, and thus enlightening them, they arrive at conclusions of their own, to which the laity must subscribe before they can come into the church.

It is said you can go somewhere, and find a creed that will suit you. But I think the constitution settled, and we have no right to alter it. If the churches are Luther's, or Calvin's, or Wesley's churches, let them adopt such rules as they please; don't let us assume the prerogative of enacting new laws for them.

I have another objection to creeds: they are made by one generation for all succeeding generations; and members now, though possibly unconscious of it, take them for, instead of, the Bible. The Methodist creed is considered binding, and as authoritative as the laws of Christ; and an individual would be expelled from the church as soon for a disregard of its requirements, as for contempt of the Bible. It assumes that the founders of the sect knew all Bible truth that was necessary to be known, and stand directly in the way of any advances.

Another objection: They incorporate what is not essential to Christian character—thereby shutting out Christians.

Again: They are substituted for the Bible, and tend to prevent free discussion. They are good for nothing unless used—and if used, they must be used as laws, or rules, or standards of doctrine. And if used in any of these ways, they are substituted for the Book of Christ left for the same purpose. They are used as a synopsis of religious truth, and save the trouble of searching the whole Bible for it. Every church should be a theological school, and all the members should be students. It does no good for the minister to preach unless the people think. The church should be all awake, and engaged in discussion, and then

they would be prepared to be benefitted by the public labors of the minister.

If we would engage to build up, and not content ourselves with tearing down, we should do more. It will do no good to cry out against sectarianism. There are warm-hearted, conscientious Christians in the sects; and if we will go on and do the work they love to see done better than they can do it in their own way, they will fall in; and before we are aware, the great sects will be gone. The labor of the church is to persuade men to turn to Christ; and let us go out into the highways and hedges, and labor and build up; and sectarianism will dissolve away like the dew.

Brother Tucker. As the brother was speaking of the church being a theological school, it occurred to me that we had an example in the scriptures. The Bereans had such a school, and searched the scriptures daily. But who were the Teachers? Who were the Doctors? How blessed it would be if we would all go directly to the Bible, and draw all our opinions thence, and not take them second-handed from others—on the authority of the creeds. I hate sectarianism, because it has done more to befog and bewilder the minds of the church, than every thing else. We have yet to learn that man is man, and capable of studying the Bible and deciding for himself. The D. D.s make a creed—the D. D.s agree to it, and then the poor laity must subscribe it or stay out of the church. But Christ has made a Bible for the poor, and we may all be teachers, and all learners. The Bereans were all teachers and all learners in their seminaries. Some commentators have admitted that praying women get nearest the truth. Why, then, not learn of each other?

Brother Cross spoke of the necessity of the church being a school for the study of the Bible. What, says he, are these creeds? Labor-saving machines, where faith is manufactured by patent right, and stereotyped; and all the candidate has to do is to lay along side and receive the impress. If his conscience happens to be a little too inflexible to be warped to the shape of the creed, he must stay out of the church; and the result is, to fill the church with a set of easy-minded, India rubber consciences, that are not troubled at a little deviation from the strictest rule of rectitude. This system of creeds is but one remove from the Papal usurpation. The Pope says, You must not have the Bible—you cannot understand it; but the creeds say, You may have the Bible, but you cannot understand it; you must think as the D. D.s say; you must come to the standard. There is no call where there is not a real or a fancied creed; and that which has called for a creed, and the ground on which they have been supposed necessary, is the ignonorance of the church. O! they must study the Bible!

[The Convention adjourned, to meet at Rochester the first Tuesday in June next.]

Having presented to the readers of the Harbinger, in this and the two preceding numbers, a large and comprehensive extract of the proceedings and sentiments of a respectable number of Ministers and others, principally of the State of New York, in convention assembled at Syracuse, August 21st, A. D. 1838, and at Cazenovia, January 30th and 31st 1839, for the desirable purpose of Christian union, we now proceed to make some remarks upon said documents.

And first, upon the whole, we greatly rejoice, that this all-important subject of Christian union is beginning to awake the public attention, not only in the State of New York; but, in some measure, throughout Protestant Christendom.

Some thirty years ago, when we addressed a portion of our fellow-Christians, in Western Pennsylvania, upon this all-important subject, we met with universal opposition from the leaders of the people, and were considered as the disturbers of religious society: but now, blessed be God, it is not only our privilege to hear of some hundreds of thousands in the United States and elsewhere, that have been awakened, by means of our humble commencement, to advocate this blessed cause, upon the pure scriptural principles of primitive apostolic Christianity; but that also now, at length, there is a voluntary movement in different parts of the camp, beyond the bounds of our co-operative agency, in favor of this blessed cause—the cause of "UNION IN TRUTH AMONGST THE FRIENDS OF TRUTH AND PEACE THROUGHOUT ALL THE CHURCHES;" for this was the sacred design and motto of our commencement,

The mode of procedure, which we proposed and adopted for this desirable purpose, was "to inculcate nothing as matter of Christian faith or duty, for which we could not produce a *thus saith the Lord*, either in express terms, or by a divinely approved precedent.—That thus returning *to*, and holding fast *by*, the original standard,—taking *the divine word alone* for our rule;—the Holy Spirit for our *teacher and guide*, to lead us into all the truth; and *Christ alone*, as exhibited in the word, for our salvation; we might, by so doing, be at peace among ourselves, follow peace with all, and holiness, without which none shall see the Lord." For this and the following quotations we refer to our Declaration and Address, published in Washington, Pennsylvania, A. D. 1809. And, of course, our proposed terms of Christian communion, or church fellowship, were as follows: see pages 16 and 17, Propositions 1, 8, and 9:—

"1. That the church of Christ upon earth is essentially, intentionally, and constitutionally one; consisting of all those in every place that profess their faith in Christ and obedience to him in all things according to the scriptures, and that manifest the same by their tempers and conduct, and of none else, as none else can be truly and properly called Christians.

"8. That whereas the Christian church, from the beginning, did, and ever will consist of little children and young men, as well as fathers; it is not, therefore, necessary that persons should have a particular knowledge or distinct apprehension of all divinely revealed truths, in order to entitle them to a place in the church; much less should they, for this purpose, be required to make a profession more extensive than their knowledge; but that, on the contrary, their having a due measure of scriptural self-knowledge, respecting their lost and perishing condition by nature and practice; and of the way of salvation through Jesus Christ, accompanied with a profession of their faith in, and obedience to him, in all things according to his word, is all that is absolutely necessary to qualify them for admission into his church.

"9. That all that are enabled, through grace, to make such a profession, and to manifest the reality of it in their tempers and conduct, should consider each other as the precious saints of God—should love each other as brethren, children of the same family and father, temples of the same spirit, members of the same body, subjects of the same grace, objects of the same divine love, bought with the same price, and joint heirs of the same inheritance. Whom God hath thus joined together, no man should dare to put asunder."

Our views of the heinous nature, ruinous effects, and fatal consequences of divisions, and of the evil causes that have produced and continued them, are thus expressed, pages 17 and 18, Props. 10 and 11:—

"10. That division among Christians is a horrid evil, fraught with many evils. It is anti-Christian, as it destroys the visible unity of the body of Christ; as if he were divided against himself, excluding and excommunicating a part of himself. It is anti-scriptural, as being strictly prohibited by his sovereign authority—a direct violation of his express command. It is anti natural, as it excites Christians to contemn, to hate, and oppose one another, who are bound by the highest and most endearing obligations to love each other as brethren, even as Christ has loved them. In a word, it is productive of confusion, and of every evil work.

"11. That, (in some instances,) a partial neglect of the expressly revealed will of God; and, (in others,) an assumed authority for making the approbation of human opinions, and human inventions, a term of communion, by introducing them into the constitution, faith or worship of the church; are, and have been, the immediate, obvious, and universally acknowledged causes, of all the corruptions and divisions that ever have taken place in the church of God."

Also our views of the constitutional perfection of the Christian church are expressed as follows, page 18, Prop. 12:—

"12. That all that is necessary to the highest state of perfection and purity of the church upon earth is, first, that none be received as members, but such as, having that due measure of scriptural self knowledge described above, do profess their faith in Christ and obedience to him in all things according to the scriptures; nor, secondly, that any be retained in her communion longer than they continue to manifest the reality of their profession by their tempers and conduct. Thirdly, that her ministers, duly and scripturally qualified, inculcate none other things than those very articles of faith and holiness expressly revealed and enjoined in the word of God. Lastly, that in all their administrations they keep close by the observance of all divine ordinances, after the example of the primitive church, exhibited in the New Testament; without any additions whatsoever of human opinions or inventions of men."

Lastly, as to circumstantials concerning which there is so much altercation among professors, we submit as follows, pp. 16, 18, Props. 5, 13:—

"5. That with respect to the commands and ordinances of our Lord Jesus Christ, where the scriptures are silent as to the express time or manner of performance, if any such there be; no human authority has power to interfere, in order to supply the supposed deficiency, by making laws for the church; nor can any thing more be required of Christians in such cases, but only that they so observe these commands and ordinances, as will evidently answer the declared and obvious end of their institution. Much less has any human authority power to impose new commands or ordinances upon the church, which our Lord Jesus Christ has not enjoined. Nothing ought to be received into the faith or worship of the church, or be made a term of communion amongst Christians, that is not as old as the New Testament.

"13. Lastly, that if any circumstantials indispensably necessary to the observance of divine ordinances be not found upon the page of express revelation, such, and such only as are absolutely necessary for this purpose, should be adopted, under the title of human expedients, without any pretence to a more sacred origin—so that any subsequent alteration or difference in the observance of these things might produce no contention nor division in the church."

Adopting, and acting upon, these principles, as apparently the only just and scriptural alternative for the multifarious corruptions and divisions which have desolated and ruined the Christian church, we have reason to rejoice that our humble commencement has been crowned with a degree of success far exceeding our most sanguine expectations; and which we humbly believe, nothing but the divine approbation could have effected; for we have been most bitterly and vehemently opposed by the leaders of all the parties—Atheistic, Deistic—Catholic and Protestant, with which we have happened to come in contact. But, blessed be God, in spite of all opposition the good cause of scriptural reformation is happily prevailing: and no doubt will continue so to do, till all anti-Christian errors and corruptions be for ever abolished.

Second, as to the propositions adopted by the Convention, they appear too indefinite; and, of course, have a tendency to produce difficulties, both to the candidates for Christian fellowship, and also to those who are to admit and receive them. We mean the 1st and 2d of the propositions that were adopted by the Convention in their former meeting at Syracuse, and the 1st of those adopted in their latter meeting at Cazenovia. For though each of those propositions may be abstractly true; and that all of them taken together might qualify the candidate for Christian fellowship, and so entitle him to admission into the church; yet a difficult point of radical importance still remains to be determined—viz Does the applicant possess these qualifications? What shall be deemed satisfactory evidence—that he believes on the Lord Jesus Christ?—That he is a subject of that regeneration, or new birth, spoken of by Jesus Christ to Nicodemus? Now if the ascertainment of these queries may be matter of very serious difficulty to the candidate himself, (as it most surely may be, if we advert to daily experience, and to the numerous efforts of preachers and writers to solve the anxious inquiries of doubting Christians, relative to these all-important matters;) how much more so must it be to those who are to be his examinators for admission. Whereas if, instead of these perplexing and almost insoluble difficulties, teachers and churches would proceed upon the divinely prescribed practice of the Apostles; namely, to preach the gospel, as heaven might grant opportunity, to every creature that had not yet professedly embraced it; and upon his being confessedly convinced and disposed to obey it, then to baptize him into the name of the Father, and

of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, for the enjoyment of the promised salvation; as Peter did upon the day of Pentecost, and afterwards carefully teach the baptized to observe all things taught by the Apostles as expressly recorded in the New Testament—they would, in so doing, do every thing, as far as teaching is concerned, that God has intended to be done for the salvation of the world. And it is only by thus assuming and acting upon original ground, as we have proposed, that ever the modern churches can be reduced to New Testament order, so as to exhibit the divine costume of the apostolic churches.

Now if this cannot be done, Christendom must remain in its apostacy; the deleterious causes and ruinous effects of which are well and truly described in the Minutes of the Convention. But we can see no reason why this cannot and should not be done, if only the proper plan be adopted. And this we presume can only be done by a direct appeal to the divine pattern itself; not, indeed, under the influence of a controversial spirit, or for controversial purposes; but rather under the influence of a penitential and heart-humbling spirit, suitably affected with a just sense of our present anti-Christian, apostatized, ruinous condition. Fo rhas not our Lord declared that "every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation, and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand"? These things being so, let our humble and earnest appeal be for direct information, how the Apostles proceeded in the execution of their commission for the conversion and salvation of the nations, that so we may perceive, receive, and inculcate their preaching and teaching. And supposing the result of such an humble, earnest, and faithful inquiry should be as follows:—That they preached Christ, the only-begotten of the Father, as sent by him into the world to seek and to save that which was lost—that whoever believed in him might not perish, but have an eternal life; and so on to the whole amount of the Apostle's testimony concerning him till his ascent into heaven, and afterwards from the day of Pentecost to the end of the book; immersing only such as professedly believed in his name, for the enjoyment of the promised salvation.—Then associating them into churches, with duly qualified bishops and deacons, ordained by the imposition of hands, with fasting and prayer—meeting the first day of every week to commemorate the death and resurrection of the Saviour—for public teaching by the proper officers, and contributions for religious purposes; then habitually continuing in the Apostles' doctrine; living soberly, righteously, and godly in this present evil world: under the vigilant exercise of a holy discipline—warning the unruly, comforting the feeble-minded, supporting the weak, purging out the old leaven, rejecting the irreclaimable: thus living and walking under the moral and religious influence of the Apostles' doctrine. Now surely we have sufficient documents in the New Testament, without just ground of controversy, for the purpose of forming such societies as this, if we admit the Book to be at all intelligible—a thing which all Christians must do. And would not a Christendom of such societies be infinitely preferable to what it is at present? Indeed, is not this the very thing that is wanting in order to restore the churches to the enjoyment of the Apostles' doctrine, and fellowship; in holy unity, unanimity, and co operation? which never can be till they all speak the same thing, and so be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment. And this never can be, till they all speak the dictations of the Holy Spirit, as delivered by the holy Apostles and Prophets. And, upon the whole, would not such an exhibition of Christianity answer all the purposes for which it was divinely intended; namely, the holiness and happiness of the believing and obedient subjects; and through them, the conversion of the world? See John xvii. 20, 23.

THOMAS CAMPBELL.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

Persons accustomed from infancy to hear doctrines invented by men, denominated "*the gospel*," are naturally led to charge gospel with whatever mixture of human imperfection these doctrines may contain.

E. HAMILTON.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME III.——NUMBER IV.

BETHANY, VA. *APRIL*, 1839.

THE GOSPEL.—*No. II.*

"Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also you have received, and wherein ye stand: by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, *how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures.*" 1 Cor. xv. 1—4.

In order to render the search for truth successful, it is requisite that we not only be guided by just principles, as we have briefly attempted to show, but that we observe a proper METHOD.

In former ages a method called the *synthetic* was in vogue, in every department of science. This consisted in propounding a certain theory or hypothesis, artfully framed, and then supporting it with all the facts and evidences which ingenuity could supply. Each ambitious leader of the various parties in Philosophy or Government, Medicine or Religion, advanced his favorite dogmas, which continued to be the creed of his followers, until they happened to be seduced by the more plausible doctrines of a new and popular Master. The consequence of this method was, that little or no improvement was made in any branch of learning. The mists of conjecture and uncertainty rested upon the boundless ocean of human inquiry; and the frail barks of theory and speculation, without a compass or a polar star, became the sport of every tide.

By this system the minds of men were placed in the most unfavorable position for the attainment of true knowledge. A finely spun and decorated system calculated to please the fancy,

and gratify the pride of reason, being once adopted, its advocates were naturally led to imagine that every thing was or ought to be in perfect harmony with it, and were readily disposed to wrest and pervert, though often unconsciously, both evidence and reason. Unenlightened by the clear radiance of the true method, a recklessness, or a no less fatal obstinacy on the part of the leaders; and a superstitious ignorance or submissive timidity on the part of the led, supplied the place of calm, just, and patient investigation. Nevertheless, the adventurous rashness, and restless activity which prevailed at this period were not altogether without useful results. Chance sometimes favored the bold experimenter with an important discovery, and this frothy fermentation of the human mind was the prelude to a purer and better product. Men were then just awaked from the sleep of the dark ages. It was the twilight which succeeded a long night of ignorance—the joyful harbinger of returning day.

It was a glorious era when the genius of the illustrious Bacon ascertained the proper method of scientific investigation, and presented to mankind the *Inductive* system. This method is, first to ascertain particular facts by observation and experience, and then to infer from these certain general truths.

It will be perceived that this is just the reverse of the former method, which boldly devised a theory first, and then brought facts to sustain it. The inductive system, on the contrary, by slow and careful examination of many facts, leads the mind to infallible conclusions. The former is Hypothesis against Fact; the latter, Fact against Hypothesis. The one is Reason and Fancy against Knowledge; and the other Knowledge and Reason against Fancy. The first was a struggle for victory, and the last a combat for truth. The issue of such a contest could not be doubtful. The inductive method has triumphantly established its authority over the investigations of science, and is universally admitted to be, in the language of its author, "The first and most important instrument of reason in its search after truth."

The consequence has been, that men have been emancipated from the shackles of error, and have pursued without restraint, and with the most unfailing success, their search for truth in the

physical and mental sciences, and have pushed their discoveries in mechanics and the useful arts to the most wonderful extent.

This system has marshalled into rank and disciplined the rude and scattered forces of facts and observations which had been arrayed against each other by former leaders, and with an overwhelming addition of numbers, has penetrated into the most distant provinces of Nature and Art. Civilization and refinement; useful inventions, and mental and moral improvement of every kind have followed in the train, and humanity has been raised to an elevation anticipated only in the fancy of the poet, or the day-dreams of the visionary philosopher.

But here we pause to notice a fact no less singular than true. It is this, that while the inductive system has been applied to every other branch of science, and has advanced them to the highest perfection, Religion has been almost wholly overlooked. The favorite points and theories of those leaders in religion who constructed their systems upon the synthetic method, have been permitted to remain even to the present moment, and to exert their narrowing and prejudicial influences over the minds of men. Their custom was to form a theory of religion, and then to cull from the Bible disconnected and often irrelevant texts to sustain their views. As the masters in the physical sciences could each find, wrest, or fabricate facts to support the hypotheses they framed; so the opposing religious teachers could each prove, by dislocated and perverted passages of scripture, his system of theology. In the *melee* of controversy and strife every means and every stratagem was employed to insure victory; and amidst the confusion, facts, and assertions; faith and opinions; institutions and doctrines; Judaism and Christianism, were indiscriminately blended.

It is true, indeed, that within a few years, and to a limited extent, there has been an approximation to the better method of biblical investigation; but it is a matter familiar to all, that, to this hour, the religious community in general are accustomed to regard the Gospel and the whole Christian Institution as a system of mere *opinions*. They make no proper distinction between divine facts, testimony, and faith, and the dogmas, conjectures, and imaginations of men; but are wont to put the whole upon a

common footing of equality. 'Every one has a right to his opinion,' they will say when dissenting from the plainest injunctions of the divine record. They will quote with complacency the language of the Apostle used expressly in relation to indifferent matters of opinion, "Let every one be fully persuaded in his own mind," and misapply it to things to be believed, as though the same Divine testimony should, as a matter of course, lead different persons to contrary views and practices. And to crown the whole, they will grant that you have scripture for your sentiments, if you will concede in turn that they have scripture for theirs.

It is very remarkable that even the most learned and able champions of religion, who have written largely upon its evidences, and dwelt with minuteness upon the testimony of nature and revelation to the being and attributes of God, have almost universally adopted that hypothetical, unassured, and timid style of treating the subject, which is the natural effect of the confusion and incertitude of the synthetic method. So far, indeed, have any of them been from applying the inductive system to religion, that after all their labored publications, it was reserved for the master-mind of Brougham to carry out the evidences of religion to their proper issue, and triumphantly to show that natural theology is really founded upon strict induction. To him belongs the credit of having first, within these few years, placed this subject upon its true basis.

It is much to be desired that a proper application of the inductive system were now made to revealed religion. We have, indeed, as regards revealed religion, no experiments to make. In the physical sciences the object of experiment is to ascertain facts and to discover what nature says. Thus when Franklin saw the lightning drawn from the clouds, and flashing from the iron key appended to his kite, it was the voice of nature informing him that lightning and electricity were the same. But in divine revelation the facts are already ascertained, the evidences are fully presented, and it is only necessary to consider and apply them. Nay, the deductions and applications are already exhibited on the page of inspiration; and it is susceptible of easy proof that the whole of Christianity may be reduced to a few

simple facts, from which, by necessary induction, its teachings and general principles, promises and threatenings, privileges and hopes naturally proceed. Thus the whole subject is simplified, and rendered easy of comprehension. The Apostles themselves, the first teachers of Christianity, began with facts, and drew from these by induction the proper inferences and rules of action. It has heretofore been the custom to begin with their conclusions, and by the aid of synthesis to build upon them an airy structure of opinions. The true method is, to begin where they began, and to end where they have set bounds at once to reason and revelation.

Induction is the true logic. It enables us to trace effects to causes; to see the natural and necessary relations of things, to analyze, classify, and arrange. There is at present nothing so necessary as this to disentangle the modern complicated state of Christianity. It is because the Christian profession has become a confused medley, that certainty has become doubt; and faith, opinion. But there cannot be a greater slur cast upon the Author of the Christian system, than to suppose this to be obscure in its principles, or uncertain and variable in its conclusions. This is at once to reduce it in authority and importance, below the humblest branch of physical science; it is, in fact, to deny to it a divine original. If, however, it be examined upon the principles of induction, its plainness and simplicity, its perfect adaptation to the wants and circumstances of the human family, and the unchanging certainty and infallible accuracy of its results leave no room for scepticism, and afford no opportunity for disagreement. This we hope will be more fully apparent as we proceed. R. R.

SIN—*A DIALOGUE.*

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 110.]

Eugenio. How extensive the influence and how fatal the workings of this mysterious power! Yet this conviction seems to me only to augment the obscurity in which it is involved. Is it not possible to take a nearer view, and by an analysis of its nature to acquire a more accurate knowledge of it?

Philander. Analytical inquiry into the nature, origin, and effects of sin, can of itself be of but little practical utility; nor can mere verbal definitions and distinctions supply us with a true knowledge of the subject. This can be learned only from observation and experience. Nevertheless a just theory may, like the frame-work of a building, afford points to which the results of observation may be suitably applied.

The Apostle John in his general epistle gives us a partial definition of sin by the synonyme *unrighteousness.** But when he says that "SIN IS THE TRANSGRESSION OF THE LAW,"† he supplies us with one which is at once concise and full, clear and philosophical. He here introduces to our notice *law* as necessarily antecedent; and therefore, in an investigation of the subject, this first demands attention. Law is a rule of action established by rightful authority. It prescribes the proper boundaries, and imposes necessary restraints; or, it describes the circle in which every thing may revolve without doing or suffering injury. Hence when any being oversteps the line by which law has circumscribed his nature, or adjusted his relations, the immediate effect is, that he comes into a dangerous and perhaps fatal collision with others. When this disregard is shown to divine law, publicly promulged, it constitutes sin. Yet this term may be applied at least analogically to aberrations from laws, neither oral nor written, but deduced from certain premises by necessary implication.

Man, as the subject of divine law, is to be regarded as sustaining various relations, and possessing in himself different natures. He enjoys in common with inferior tribes, an animal constitution or corporeal frame, which subjects him to the operation of some of the laws by which inert matter is governed, as well as of those which belong to this peculiar animal organization itself. To these he finds it his happiness to submit; nor can he, without injury, act in derogation of them. Should he disregard the law of gravity, by which all matter is controlled, and leap from a precipice, he suffers for his temerity in the wounds and bruises he receives. And if, when shivering with cold, he draws too near the fire and exposes the delicate tissues which compose his body to a degree of heat greater than the laws of their organization enable them to bear, he pays the penalty in the pain and suffering consequent upon his imprudence. In these instances he may from analogy be said to sin against or transgress the laws of his *animal* constitution. He does so also, indeed, whenever he is guilty of intemperance or excess in the indulgence of natural desires. For so great is the intimacy between man's corporeal, moral, and intellectual

* 1 John v. 17. † 1 John iii, 4.

natures, that excess affects them all in a greater or less degree. But errors of this character are to be classed primarily as sins against the MORAL nature of man. It is to these that the term *sins* legitimately belongs. The Divine Being has published no laws for the animal constitution. These we ascertain by our own observation and experience. It is to the moral and intellectual natures of man that he has addressed his written code. So that sin, in its true scriptural import, denotes a transgression of the written law of God. And this law has for its object so to direct and restrain the powers and faculties of man, that they may contribute to his best interests and greatest happiness.

Eugenio. Divine law, then, is not, as some imagine, a mere arbitrary expression of authority, but a rule of action precisely adapted to the nature or natures of that which is the subject of it. In fact, it is, as you observe, that which defines the nature of every being, and marks out the boundaries within which its powers may be safely exercised. We can form no conception of any thing being without a nature, and a nature necessarily implies laws by which it is regulated and circumscribed. It would follow, then, that the injury occasioned by a disregard of these laws, is not only a necessary consequence of such disregard; but that the pain or suffering experienced by the sensitive creation upon a transgression of the laws which govern their peculiar organization, is a mark of the benevolence of the Creator, inasmuch as it is a warning of danger and a stimulus to self-preservation. To use the illustration you have introduced: If we expose ourselves to a degree of cold too great for the system to support without injury, we are warned by pain to approach the fire. We now experience a pleasurable sensation so long as the amount of heat is limited to a certain point; and pain warns us the moment we transcend the salutary boundary. It is by the vigilance of this sentinel, which, like Argus, looks forth from every part of the body, that we are preserved amidst the dangers to which we are ever exposed.

Philander. Even so: and it will be as apparent to the candid inquirer that the suffering or punishment denounced and inflicted, where the divine law relating to our moral nature is transgressed, is as necessary a consequence, and proceeds from as benevolent an intention. As the animal is inferior in dignity to the moral and intellectual part of man, so is even his intellectual nature subordinate to the moral. It would, then, be an anomaly in the divine government if this nature were not even more sedulously guarded, and if the laws by which it is regulated were not enforced by still more powerful sanctions. The intellectual nature of man comprises those mental faculties by which he perceives,

remembers, compares, judges. The moral nature embraces his feelings or affections, of which are love, generosity, meekness, condescension, courage, fidelity, gentleness, &c. It is in respect to these two natures that man is created in the Divine image. For God has revealed himself as a Being who sees, remembers, and judges; who is possessed of generosity, faithfulness, condescension, love. It is, then, to regulate these natures, and through them the corporeal or animal, that we are provided with the written law of God—prescribing what lessons we should learn, what knowledge we should seek, what noble and virtuous principles we should foster; what objects we should love, in order to render us as happy as the capacity of our nature will admit. Not only the law, then, but all the penalties designed to secure it from violation, proceed from the same source—the benevolence or philanthropy of God. He hates, denounces, and punishes sin, the transgression of this law, because he loves man, and would preserve him from self-destruction. Nay, in willing our sanctification in body, soul, and spirit; in desiring that all our powers and faculties be subordinated to unerring principles of rectitude adapted to our nature and condition, he wills our highest happiness.

According to our present organization, then, sin has a natural tendency to produce misery. But, as I before intimated, we cannot by our reasonings acquire a true knowledge of its nature. Would we know what it is, we must be acquainted with what it does; as we recognize, by its effects, the lightning which has rifted the tall cedar or the knotted oak. Verbal explanations and definitions can only refer us to the thing itself, and this we discover, alas! only by its fatal effects. If a man put his hand into the fire, he disregards indeed the laws of his animal frame; but we see and understand the nature of the act by its unhappy consequences. Sin then, in fact, is fear, pain, sorrow, and anguish, revenge, ignorance, idolatry, hatred, murder, death. * * * * It is the catalogue of all the woes of mortality. The history of all the misfortunes of the human race forms but a chapter of the history of sin. Its briars and thistles grow in every soil. It arms every rose with thorns, and poisons every cup of happiness. It directs the blow of the assassin, and excites animosity between those who are connected by the nearest earthly ties. It whets the glittering sword of the warrior and burnishes the spear. It arms the Persian chariot with scythes, and points the barbed arrow of the Scythian, and covers the earth with ruin and desolation. Nor need we wonder at the magnitude of its effects, when we remember that it employs the mighty powers and energies of humanity for their accomplishment. How stupendous must those capacities and faculties be, which can perform such things when perverted

and misapplied! Sin has directed man's hand against his own bosom. It has put out his eyes, as the Philistines did those of Sampson, so that his heaven-born strength is employed against himself—and he dies amidst the ruin which he has made. R. R.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

SCEPTICISM.

LETTERS TO A SCEPTIC—*No. II.*

PLEASANT VALLEY, March 8th, 1839.

My dear Friend,

AFTER a long silence I again resume the pen to address you. Of the facts connected with my bereavement you have been duly informed; but the *mercy* and *consolation* mingled with my affliction you can never know, until you leave the gloomy vale of scepticism. Indeed, it seems to me that the death of my beloved wife would have been altogether insupportable to me, without the hope of meeting her again in a world of bliss.

What thought so gloomy as "death an eternal sleep"? What so forbidding as that man shall perish like the beasts? How vastly preferable is the most corrupted form of true religion to absolute unbelief. How forcible the words of Napoleon, which he uttered towards the close of his life. He says, "In the absence of *religion*, I can discover no inducement to be virtuous: I desire to live and die in mine. Nothing is more painful to me than the hideous spectacle of an old man dying like a dog." When our friends, amiable, lovely, refined, and intelligent are taken from us, how blissful the assurance that they still live; that they are only removed from one sphere of action to another more enlarged and exalted. When I think of the brilliant intellect and the beaming eye of my beloved ALICIA, how could I bear the thought that they should be forever "dark in death"? You will impute nothing more to me than conjugal weakness, if I apply to her words applied to one of her sex who perished in the snowy mountains of Switzerland:—

> "She seem'd a form of life and light;
> That, seen, became a part of sight;
> And rose where'er he turn'd his eye,
> The morning star of memory!"

And *can* such a one have sunk into an eternal oblivion? Heaven forbid! It *cannot* be!

But I am again admonished that this is not argument. I will, therefore, turn to your objections. You say you "believe all religionists agree in ascribing to the Creator omniscience and omnipotence, as well as infinite wisdom and goodness; yet an enemy comes in to thwart his designs:" and you ask, "Did he do this *with*, or *without*, the knowledge and consent of the Creator?" The whole difficulty here arises from not attending to a distinction which Sceptics as well as

Christians admit "There is a universe of *matter*, and a universe of *mind*;" and there are the laws of matter, and the laws of mind. They are entirely distinct. The universe of matter was designed to be controlled by *power;* but the universe of mind, by *authority*. The *power* of the Creator is irresistible; but not so with his *authority*. The weakest *mind* can resist his *moral power*, or authority. The omnipotence of the Creator can doubtless crush or annihilate *every thing* it could *create*. "He can create, and he destroy." But "there are no fetters for the mind." It can only be *governed* or *controlled* by motive. Here I would be *emphatic;* and though it were at the hazard of differing from the whole world, I would assert that mind can only be *governed* by *motive*. But authority is based upon power, and is always felt in proportion to the convictions of the power of the lawgiver. The authority of a monarch is proportioned to the resources of his power. The conqueror unsheathes his sword and vanquishes nations by his *power*, in order that he may establish his authority; but what conqueror would feel himself honored by the submission of subjects, if every act of obedience was *extorted* by the sword and the spear?

You ask, "Where this enemy came from?" I ask in turn, Whence came the furious and traitorous Arnold, leading a foreign foe to desolate the plains of New Jersey? He came from the ranks of the republican army, where he had been a brave and victorious leader. But *motive* changed his mind. The application is easy.

But there is a doctrine at the foundation of your difficulty, which is held by Christians as well as Sceptics, that "mind may be renovated, governed, and controlled by an irresistible influence." It appears to me superlatively absurd. The Creator exerted his *power* in the origination f the universe in order that he might *govern* it. The fact of creation gave him a right to govern; and his glory consists in a wise arrangement of motives, and not in the bare exercise of power. Suppose angels and men had been created incapable of sinning, what sort of beings must they have been? They must have been bound by the instinct of the brute, or the insensibility of a stone: and what honor could have resulted to the great Creator from the control of such a universe as that? We cannot at all conceive of the possibility of creating beings capable of *knowing* and *enjoying* their Creator, and yet the *possible* existence of moral evil excluded. In the mean time I wish you to understand that I shall not permit you to make objections the whole time. I will find every objection against the wisdom and goodness of the order of things in nature around us, which you can find against God's moral government set forth in the scriptures. I can object as speciously against the existence of natural poison, as you against moral poisons. What would you think of the wisdom of a father, who, for fear his children should pluck the deadly nightshade, or be bitten by the envenomed serpent, or fall into the fire, should bind them with chains and confine them in a dungeon? This would be to deprive them of all enjoyment for fear of harm. But parents think it better to hazard these evils than to fortify against them in this way. What would you think of the wisdom of the man who should proclaim to the world the necessity of extinguishing fire universally, because it was the source of immense evil? Now as you would answer these things, so would I answer your difficulties. The man who would exclude the

possibility of moral evil, would, at the same time, shut out every source of rational enjoyment. Thus, to use the language of our friend Campbell, "such a value did the Creator set upon rational liberty, that, rather than destroy it, he chose to hazard all the tremendous consequences of apostacy."

In my next I shall notice your objections to the scriptural plan of a Mediator.——Your friend,

M. S. CLAPP.

CHRISTIAN UNION.

When I took upon myself, in the absence of the Editor, to introduce this subject from the columns of the Union Herald into the pages of the Harbinger, it was not for the purpose of criticising, but from my cordial attachment to this deeply interesting and important subject; and because I believed it would appear so to the majority of our readers. Having, therefore, submitted it in the three preceding numbers, with a few remarks in the last; I now proceed to consider it anew, independent of all that has been said in the preceding extracts, with this only remark upon the whole,—that no conscientious, honest, intelligent Christian can possibly read the said extracts, without being fully convinced of the heinous nature, ruinous effects, and tremendous consequences of the present corrupted and divided condition of the Cristian profession; and, of course, of the immediate, indispensable, and paramount duty of attempting a genuine scriptural reformation, that would re-exhibit, and restore to the world, pure, primitive, apostolic Christianity, in letter and spirit—in principle and practice. But now, in order to this, still the grand question remains to be answered; viz. How is this to be attempted, that it may be successfully accomplished? Or, is the thing indeed possible?—To the latter we reply in the affirmative; for we have the prayer of Christ for it, John xvii. 20—23; and the promise of God, Isai. xi. 9., &c. And are we not all looking for a Millennium of universal peace and prosperity, in which truth shall universally triumph? These things being so, our grand concern and present duty is, to adopt the proper means for accomplishing this truly blissful and desirable object. Now, in order to the successful undertaking of any arduous enterprize, three things are indispensably necessary.—1st. That the undertakers be duly qualified. 2d. That they use the proper means. 3d. That they make the proper use of them.

Here, then, it may be asked:—What are the necessary qualifications for this heavenly enterprize?

We would answer:—1st. A competent knowledge of the holy scriptures, with a deep-felt conviction of the deleterious nature and extent

of the evils to be obviated. 2d. A correspondent sorrow on account of their prevalence. 3d. An humble confidential reliance upon the divine assistance and efficiency for the desired success in the proper use of the divinely appointed means. Again, is it asked,—What are these?—The answer is obvious.—The word of God and prayer. These are the mighty means which Heaven has appointed for the achievement of all divine conquests, in this present evil world.—*The word of truth—the prayer of faith*—these are omnipotent. Of the former, the New Testament alone containing the divine exhibition of Christianity, for the salvation of a perishing world; to *it*, therefore, we must have direct and immediate recourse, as our only and proper directory of faith and practice. But, is it asked, for what special purpose should Unionists make this dernier appeal to the divine testimony? Is it to determine the respective claims of the sects,—of each in relation to its exclusive orthodoxy; and thus to settle the sectarian controversies of fifteen hundred years?—Surely not. Half a century would not suffice to make the experiment; much less could we reasonably expect to achieve in that space, what fifteen centuries had failed to accomplish. No—the proposed appeal must be for a quite different purpose: namely—to learn from the Book itself, the religion taught by the divinely commissioned Apostles of Jesus, its inspired authors:—and for this purpose to receive it out of their hands, as if immediately sent down from heaven; as if we had never seen it; or heard of it before; for, as such, we must be judged by it in the last day. "He that heareth you heareth me; and he that despiseth you despiseth me; and he that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me.—The word that I have spoken shall judge him in the last day; for I have not spoken of myself; but the Father who sent me gave me a commandment what I should speak." Luke x. 16.; John xii. 48. As such, then, we should advert to its contents, believe what it declares, and do what it enjoins. Thus will we speak and hear, believe and obey *it*;—even *it alone*, and not a human explanation of it. But may we not be at a loss to understand it? How shall we do *then?* Ans. We must not admit this supposition. On the contrary, we must presume it is perfectly intelligible for the end for which it was given: see Isai. xxxv. 8., with 2 Tim. iii. 15—17. "A highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called—The way of Holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those: (i. e. the timid, the blind, the lame, the deaf, the dumb, the very refuse of mankind;) the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein." "And, that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise to salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus:—thoroughly furnished to all good

works." Thus, in the mean time, receiving it anew out of the hand of Heaven, it would illy become us, as Unionists, to anticipate and start difficulties; it will be soon enough to advert to them, when they occur. Our great and only concern must be, truly to understand, believe, and obey the Book. And, for this purpose, to make the proper use of it, beginning with the divine orders for the universal exhibition of its contents, which gave rise to its publication; and, of course, made it public property. Thus we shall have its divine contents brought fairly before us,—every thing in its proper place: see Matth. xxviii. 16—20.; Mark xvi. 15, 16.; Luke xxiv. 46—48.; Acts ii. 32, 37—39. "The eleven disciples went away into Galilee, to a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And Jesus came and spake to them, saying, All power is given to me in heaven and on earth. Go ye, therefore, into all the world, preach the gospel to every creature, disciple all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatever I have commanded you.—He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned:—and, lo, I am with you always, even to the conclusion of this state." Moreover he said to them, "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that reformation and remission of sins should be preached in his name to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things."

3. Now from these orders, thus delivered to the Apostles, all the contents of the Book evidently proceed in the very order in which they are presented to us, for *they* proceeded accordingly. For thus beginning in Jerusalem, on the day of Pentecost, in the midst of a great congregation assembled out of all nations, they first preached the gospel in order to faith, as exhibited by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, as far as the case required. In the second place, they preached repentance, or reformation, and remission of sins through baptism to every one who believed it; saying, "Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles, and wonders, and signs which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know: him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, you have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain: whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it.—This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses.—Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath shed forth this which you now see and hear.—Therefore, let all

the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom you have crucified, both Lord and Christ. Now when they heard this, they were pierced to the heart, and said to Peter and to the rest of the Apostles, Men, brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said to them, Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For the promise is to you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." Acts ii. 22., &c. Thenceforward in their Acts and Epistles they teach the baptized all things whatsoever they should observe and do.

Thus have we got a prospectus of the contents and order of the blessed Book fairly before us. What remains, then, but that we go seriously to work? 1. To ascertain the true character and doctrine of Christ; that so believing in him, we might have life through his name; John xx. 31., and thus be prepared for baptism. 2. That thus believing we be baptized for the actual enjoyment of the promised salvation; that is, for the remission of our sins, and for the gift of the Holy Spirit, which is given to all that believe. Acts ii. 38. 3. And that we henceforth continue stedfast in the Apostles' doctrine, as did the primitive converts, diligently observing all things that they have commanded us. Acts ii. 42. "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added to them about three thousand souls; and they continued stedfastly in the Apostles's doctrine, and in the fellowship, and in the breaking of the bread, and in the prayers"

4. Thus are we divinely instructed to proceed in order to a life of holiness; which, in this world, is the ultimate intention of the gospel; and without which none shall enjoy the divine presence in a life to come.

Now, as to those "*all things*," which the Apostles were commanded to teach the believers to observe—it appears from the Book—1st. That as soon as they were baptized upon their professed belief of the gospel, they were associated as fellow-disciples and brethren in Christ—Acts ii. 44, 46, 47. All that believed were together, and had all things common.—And they continued daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house.—And the Lord added the saved daily to the church. 2d. That those societies, called churches, were committed to the superintendence of bishops and deacons: see Acts vi. 2—6., and xiv. 23.: Phil. i. 1. "Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples, and said, It is not fit that we should leave the word of God and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look you out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Spirit and wisdom, whom

we may appoint over this business: but we will give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word. And they chose seven —whom they set before the Apostles; and when they had prayed they laid hands on them"—"And when they had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord on whom they believed." To all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons.

3. That those were elders, or elderly persons, heads of families, possessing special qualifications; 1 Tim. iii. 2—12.: Titus i. 5—9. "A bishop must be blameless the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour, given to hospitality, apt to teach; not given to wine, not a striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous; one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; (for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?) Not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover, he must have a good report of them that are without, lest he fall into reproach, and the snare of the devil. Likewise must the deacons be grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre; holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience. Let these also first be proved; then let them use the office of a deacon, being found blameless. Even so must the women (deaconess) be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things. Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well."—"For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city as I had appointed thee. If any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot, or unruly; for a bishop must be blameless as the steward of God; not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, not a striker, not given to filthy lucre; but a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men;—sober, just, holy, temperate; holding forth the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able, by sound doctrine, both to exhort, and to convince the gainsayers."

4. That the former were also called stewards, pastors, and teachers; officially teaching and ruling the churches for their spiritual edification and comfort. The latter—called deacons, or servants; officially attending to the distribution of the contributions of the churches, for charitable and religious purposes: Acts 6. 2, 3; Rom. xvi. 1, 2. "Then the twelve called the multitude of the disciples, and said, It is not reasonable that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables. Wherefore, brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Spirit and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this

business."—"I commend to you Phebe our sister, who is a servant (or deaconess) of the church which is at Cenchrea; that you receive her in the Lord as becometh saints; and that you assist her in whatever business she hath need of you: for she hath been a succorer of many, and of myself also."

5. That those officers chosen by the people for whom they were to officiate, were regularly ordained with fasting and prayer, by the imposition of the hands of Apostles, or of Evangelists, or of the presbytery of a particular congregation: Acts vi. 5, 6,; and xiv. 23.; 1 Tim. iv. 14.; and v. 22.; Titus i. 5. "And the saying pleased the whole multitude; and they chose seven, whom they set before the Apostles; and when they had prayed they laid hands on them."—"And when they had ordained them elders in every church, and prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord on whom they believed."—"Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery."—"Lay hands suddenly on no man; neither be partaker of other mens' sins: keep thyself pure."—"For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee."

6. That as those officers, teachers, and rulers were invested with an awful responsibility, for the due and faithful performance of the arduous and highly important duties of their office; so also were the brethren for whom they officiated, equally bound to submit to them, and to support them in the execution of their official duties: Matth xxiv. 45.; Acts xx. 28—35.; 1 Cor ix. 1—14.; Gal. vi 6; 1 Thess. v. 12, 13.; 1 Tim. v. 17, 18.; Heb. xiii. 7, 17, 24. "Who, then, is a faithful and wise servant, whom the Lord hath made ruler over his household, to give them meat in due season? Blessed is that servant whom his Lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing. Verily, I say to you, that he shall make him ruler over all his goods. But and if that evil servant shall say in his heart, My Lord delayeth his coming; and shall begin to smite his fellow-servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken; the Lord of that servant shall come in a day that he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall cut him asunder, and appoint his portion with the hypocrites."—"From Miletus Paul sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church. And when they were come to him, he said to them—Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Spirit hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood. Therefore watch, and remember, that, by the space of three years, I ceased not to warn every one, night and day, with tears. And now, brethren, I

commend you to God, and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up, and to give you an inheritance among all them that are sanctified."—"Do you not know, that they who minister about holy things live of the temple? and that they who wait at the altar, are partakers with the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained, that they who preach the gospel, should live of the gospel."—"Let him that is taught in the word, communicate to him who teaches in all good things." "We beseech you, brethren, to know them who labor among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in love for their work sake."—"Let the elders that rule well, be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine. For the scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn."—"Remember them that have the rule over you, who have spoken to you the word of God; whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation:—Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.—Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account; that they may do it with joy, and not with grief; for that is unprofitable for you."

7. That the churches, thus organized, met respectively on the first day of the week, called "The Lord's Day," to celebrate his resurrection, and to commemorate his death; and for other exercises of spiritual edification; viz.—praying, singing, teaching, exhorting, and contributing to the relief of the poor: Acts xx. 7.; 1 Cor. x. 16, 17.; and xi. 20—34,; and xiv. 1—40.; and xvi. 1, 2. "On the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul discoursed to them."—"The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? Because there is one loaf, we, the many, are one body; for we are all partakers of the one loaf."—"For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered to you; that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed took a loaf, and when he had given thanks, he break it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye as oft as you drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as you eat this loaf, and drink this cup, you do show the Lord's death till he came."—For the further edification of the church by the proper use of the spiritual gifts primarily conferred for that purpose, see the 14th chapter throughout. "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every

one of you lay by him in store, as God has prospered him; that there be no gatherings when I come." "I was in the spirit on the Lord's day." Acts xx. 7.; 1 Cor. x. 16, 17., and xi. 20—34., and xiv. 1—40., and xvi. 1, 2.

8. That all church members were to exercise a benevolent vigilance over each other for the purpose of godly edification. 1 Thess. v. 11, 14.; Heb. iii. 13., and x. 24, 25. "Comfort yourselves together, and edify one another, even as also you do."—"Now we exhort you, brethren, warn them that are unruly, comfort the feeble-minded, support the weak, be patient toward all."—"Exhort one another daily while it is called to-day, lest any be hardened through the deceitfulness of sin."—"Let us consider one another to provoke to love and to good works: not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another: and so much the more, as you see the day approaching."

9. That in case of personal offences,—the offender should take prompt and immediate steps to remove the offence. Matth. v. 9, 23. "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift."

10. That, if this were not done, the offended should proceed according to Matthew xviii. 15—18. "If thy brother trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone: if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother. But if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that, in the mouth of two or three witnesses, every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it to the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be to thee as a heathen man and a publican. Verily, I say to you, whatever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatever you shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven."

11. That the public transgressor of the law of Christ should be publicly rebuked, that others might be deterred from so doing; and thus the sacred character of the church be preserved unsullied. 1 Cor. v. 6—8. 9, 11, 13.; 1 Tim. v. 20. "Know you not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out, therefore, the old leaven, that you may be a new lump, as you are unleavened. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us: therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."—"I have written to you not to keep company—if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolator, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extor-

tioner, with such a one not to eat. Therefore, put away from among yourselves that wicked person."—"Them that sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear."

12. That if any disciple become a heretic,—a factionist or sectarian—continuing such after the first and second admonition, he should be rejected, that so the church might thus preserve its unity and purity. Titus iii. 10, 11.; Rom. xvi. 17, 18. "A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition reject; knowing that he, that is such, is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself."

13. In short, that all the disciples, male and female, so perform their mutual relative duties, according to the law of Christ, that there be no just ground of complaint; viz.—as husbands and wives. Col. iii. 18, 19. "Wives, submit yourselves to your own husbands, as it is fit in the Lord. Husbands, love your wives, and be not bitter against them."—Masters and servants—Col. iii. 22—25. "Servants, obey in all things your masters according to the flesh; not with eye-service, as men-pleasers; but in singleness of heart fearing God. And whatever you do, do it heartily, as to the Lord, and not to men; knowing that of the Lord you shall receive the reward of the inheritance; for you serve the Lord Christ. But he that doeth wrong, shall receive for the wrong that he hath done; and there is no respect of persons." iv. 1. "Masters, give to your servants that which is just and equal; knowing that you also have a Master in heaven."—Parents and children—chap. iii. 20, 21.—"Children, obey your parents in all things: for this is well-pleasing to the Lord. Fathers, provoke not your children, lest they be discouraged."—Brothers and sisters—Rom. xii. 10., and 1 Pet. iii. 8. "Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love; in honor preferring one another; love as brethren; be pitiful, be courteous."—Neighbors and citizens—Rom. xiii. 7—10. "Render to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor: owe no man any thing, but to love one another. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law."

14. That Christian families be nurseries for heaven: Eph. vi. 4. "Fathers, provoke not your children to wrath; but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

15. And, that every individual Christian, respectively, be a student of the Holy Scriptures. Col. iii. 16.; 1 Peter ii. 2. "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly; with all wisdom teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord.—As new-born babes, desire the pure milk of the word, that you may grow thereby."

16.—And thus become pious, temperate, just, generous, kind, charitable, gentle, humble, meek, merciful, patient, long-suffering, forbearing, forgiving, faithful, veracious, industrious, zealous, chaste, pure-hearted, holy, entirely devoted to God in a life of humble self-denying obedience;—that whether they eat or drink, or whatever they do in word or deed, they do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him:—*doing all to the glory of God.* 1 Cor. x. 31.; Col. iii. 17.

Now if we add to the express and incontestible injunctions, to possess and practise these,—(and every other practical virtue of which our nature, through the divine grace, is capable,)—the illustrious and encouraging examples, and the exceeding great and precious promises, both for present assistance and future reward, presented in the Holy Scriptures; what more, with respect to instruction and encouragement, could we desire to ameliorate our condition, or perfect our character? And if, through the knowledge and belief of the gracious declarations, invitations, and promises of the gospel, we be so filled with the blissful confidence, hope, and love, which they are calculated to inspire, as to dispose and excite us to the dutiful practice of the above means and virtues, expressly inculcated in and by the precepts and examples of the Holy Scriptures; will not our character be as perfect as it can be in this life? And if so, what more can be desired or required?

Upon the whole—comparing the above synopsis of primitive apostolic Christianity, with the historic account of the faith and practice of the Christians of the first and second centuries, we find it happily realized, in spite of the oppositions and persecutions of that dreary and trying period.—Consequently, that we have not therein mistaken the true meaning of the apostolic writings; for certainly if they were ever correctly understood, it was by those who first received them, and by their immediate successors. We make this appeal to the understanding and practice of the primitive churches, not to authorize *our faith and practice*, but merely to show, that *we* understand the apostolic writings upon those subjects, just as they were understood from the beginning. And this we think all true Christian unionists are bound to do; because it is only upon the belief of the apostolic doctrine, that Christ has proposed and prayed for the unity of his people. John xvii. 20, 21.

THOMAS CAMPBELL.

SKETCHES OF RELIGIOUS HISTORY.

[We take the following from a pamphlet lately published by a congregation of Disciples in the city of New York.]

DISCIPLES OF CHRIST.

THERE are in the United States about two hundred thousand [professors of the Ancient Gospel] who distinguish themselves from other denominations of professing Christians by the above scriptural name. The congregation, worshipping in *North street*, opposite the Oliver Free School, stands in connexion with all the other churches of Disciples throughout the United States; and in order to answer the inquiries so frequently made, such as, "Who are these people?" "Where did they spring from?" "What do they profess?" and the like, the congregation has thought it advisable to publish the following plain statement of facts, and candid representation of their views and practices, taken from Brown's Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge. They do not print it as their *creed;* for all creeds, rules, and confessions of faith are rejected by them, except those which are found on the pages of inspiration:—

"The rise of this society, if we only look back to the drawing of the lines of demarkation between it and other professors, is of recent origin. About the commencement of the present century, the Bible alone, without any human addition in the form of creeds or confessions of faith, began to be plead and preached by many distinguished ministers of different denominations, both in Europe and America.

With various success, and with many of the opinions of the various sects imperceptibly carried with them from the denominations to which they once belonged, did the advocates of the Bible cause plead for the union of Christians of every name on the broad basis of the Apostles' teaching. But it was not until the year 1823, that a restoration of the *original gospel* and *order of things* began to be plead in a periodical, edited by Alexander Campbell, of Bethany, Virginia, entitled "The Christian Baptist."

He and his father, Thomas Campbell, renounced the Presbyterian system, and were immersed in the year 1812. They, and the congregations which they had formed, united with the Redstone Baptist Association; protesting against all human creeds as bonds of union, and professing subjection to the Bible alone. This union took place in the year 1813. But in pressing upon the attention of that society and the public the all-sufficiency of the *sacred* Scriptures for every thing necessary to the perfection of Christian character, whether in the private or social relations of life, in the church or in the world, they began to be opposed by a strong creed-party in that Association. After some ten years' debating and contending for the Bible alone and the Apostles' doctrine, Alexander Campbell and the church to which he belonged, united with the Mahoning Association, in the Western Reserve of Ohio, that Association being more favorable to his views of reform.

In his debates on the subject and action of baptism with Mr. Walker, a Seceding minister, in the year 1820, and with Mr. M'Calla, a Presbyterian minister, of Kentucky, in the year 1823, his views of reformation began to be developed, and were very generally received by the Baptist society, as far as these works were read.

But in his "Christian Baptist," which began July 4, 1823, his views of the need of reformation were more fully exposed; and as these gained ground by the pleading of various ministers of the Baptist denomination, a party in opposition began to exert itself, and to oppose the spread of what they were pleased to call heterodoxy. But not till after great numbers began to act upon these principles, was there any attempt towards separation. After the Mahoning Association appointed Mr. Walter Scott an evangelist, in the year 1827, and when great numbers began to be immersed into Christ under his labors, and new churches began to be erected by him and other laborers in the field, did the Baptist Associations begin to declare non-fellowship with the brethren of the reformation. Thus by constraint, not of choice, they were obliged to form societies out of those communities that split upon the ground of adherence to the Apostles' doctrine. Within the last seven years they have increased with the most unprecedented rapidity; and during the present year (1833) not much less than ten thousand have joined the standard of reformation. They probably at this time, in the United States alone, amount to at least one hundred thousand. The distinguishing characteristics of their views and practices are the following:—

They regard all the sects and parties of the Christian world as having, in greater or less degrees, departed from the simplicity of faith and manners of the first Christians, and as forming what the Apostle Paul calls "The Apostacy." This defection they attribute to the great varieties of speculation and metaphysical dogmatism of the countless creeds, formularies, liturgies, and books of discipline adopted and inculcated as bonds of union and platforms of communion in all the parties which have sprung from the Lutheran reformation. The effects of these synodical covenants, conventional articles of belief, and rules of ecclesiastical polity, has been the introduction of a new nomenclature, a human vocabulary of religious words, phrases, and technicalities, which has displaced the style of the living oracles, and affixed to the sacred diction ideas wholly unknown to the Apostles of Christ.

To remedy and obviate these aberrations, they propose to ascertain from the holy Scriptures, according to the commonly-received and well-established rules of interpretation, the ideas attached to the leading terms and sentences found in the holy Scriptures, and then to use the words of the Holy Spirit in the apostolic acceptation of them.

By thus expressing the ideas communicated by the Holy Spirit in the terms and phrases learned from the Apostles, and by avoiding the artificial and technical language of scholastic theology, they propose to restore a pure speech to the household of faith; and by accustoming the family of God to use the language and dialect of the heavenly Father, they expect to promote the sanctification of one another through the truth, and to terminate those discords and debates which have always originated from the words which man's wisdom teaches, and from a reverential regard and esteem for the style of the great masters of polemic divinity; believing that speaking the same things in the same style, is the only certain way to thinking the same things.

They make a very marked difference between faith and opinion; between the testimony of God and the reasonings of men; the words of the Spirit and human inferences. Faith in the testimony of God and

obedience to the commandments of Jesus, are the bond of union; and not an agreement in any abstract views or opinions upon what is written or spoken by divine authority. Hence all the speculations, questions, debates of words, and abstract reasonings found in human creeds, have no place in their religious fellowship. Regarding Calvinism and Arminianism, Trinitarianism and Unitarianism, and all the opposing theories of religious sectaries, as *extremes* begotten by each other, they cautiously avoid them, as equi-distant from the simplicity and practical tendency of the promises and precepts, of the doctrine and facts, of the exhortations and precedents of the Christian institution.

They look for unity of spirit and the bonds of peace in the practical acknowledgment of one faith, one Lord, one immersion, one hope, one body, one Spirit, one God and Father of all; not in unity of opinions, nor in unity of forms, ceremonies, or modes of worship.

The holy Scriptures of both Testaments they regard as containing revelations from God, and as all necessary to make the man of God perfect, and accomplished for every good word and work; the New Testament, or the living oracles of Jesus Christ, they understand as containing the Christian religion; the testimonies of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, they view as illustrating and proving the great proposition on which our religion rests—viz. *that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, the only-begotten and well-beloved Son of God, and the only Saviour of the world;* the Acts of the Apostles as a divinely-authorized narrative of the beginning and progress of the reign or kingdom of Jesus Christ, recording the full development of *the gospel* by the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven, and the procedure of the Apostles in setting up the church of Christ on earth; the Epistles are as carrying out and applying the doctrine of the Apostles to the practice of individuals and congregations, and as developing the tendencies of the gospel in the behaviour of its professors; and all as forming a complete standard of Christian faith and morals, adapted to the interval between the ascension of Christ and his return with the kingdom which he has received from God; the Apocalypse, or Revelation of Jesus Christ to John in Patmos, as a figurative and prospective view of all the fortunes of Christianity, from its date to the return of the Saviour.

Every one who sincerely believes the testimony which God gave of Jesus of Nazareth, saying, "*This is my Son, the beloved, in whom I delight;*" or, in other words, believes what the Evangelists and Apostles have testified concerning him, from his conception to his coronation in heaven as Lord of all; and who is willing to obey him in every thing, they regard as a proper subject of immersion, and no one else. They consider immersion into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, after a public, sincere, and intelligent confession of the faith in Jesus, as necessary to admission to the privileges of the kingdom of the Messiah, and as a solemn pledge on the part of Heaven, of the actual remission of all past sins, and of adoption into the family of God.

The Holy Spirit is promised only to those who believe and obey the Saviour. No one is taught to expect the reception of that heavenly Monitor and Comforter as a resident in his heart till he obeys the gospel.

Thus while they proclaim faith and repentance, or faith and a change of heart, as preparatory to immersion, remission, and the gift of the Holy

Spirit, they say to all penitents, or all those who believe and repent of their sins, as Peter said to the first audience addressed after the Holy Spirit was bestowed after the glorification of Jesus, "Be immersed every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus, for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." They teach sinners that God commands *all men* every where to reform or turn to God, that the Holy Spirit strives with them to do so by the Apostles and Prophets, that God beseeches them to be reconciled through Jesus Christ, and that it is the duty of all men to believe the gospel and to turn to God.

The immersed believers are congregated into societies according to their propinquity to each other, and taught to meet the first day of every week in honor and commemoration of the resurrection of Jesus, and to break the loaf which commemorates the death of the Son of God, to read and hear the living oracles, to teach and admonish one another, to unite in all prayer and praise, to contribute to the necessities of saints, and to perfect holiness in the fear of the Lord.

Every congregation chooses its own overseers and deacons, who preside over and administer the affairs of the congregations; and every church, either from itself or in co-operation with others, sends out, as opportunity offers, one or more evangelists, or proclaimers of the word, to preach the word and to immerse those who believe, to gather congregations, and to extend the knowledge of salvation where it is necessary, as far as their means extend. But every church regards these evangelists as its servants, and therefore they have no control over any congregation, each congregation being subject to its own choice of presidents or elders whom they have appointed. Perseverance in all the work of faith, labor of love, and patience of hope, is inculcated by all the disciples as essential to admission into the heavenly kingdom.

Such are the prominent outlines of the faith and practices of those who wish to be known as the Disciples of Christ; but no society among them would agree to make the preceding items either a confession of faith or a standard of practice; but, for the information of those who wish an acquaintance with them, are willing to give at any time a reason for their faith, hope, and practice."

CHRISTIANS AMONG THE SECTS—*No. III.*

SINCERITY.

"He that walketh slowly, walketh surely," said an ancient man. Christianos had intended hastening at once in this essay to his primary design, touching positive ordinances: but finding that numerous objections are arising, he deems it necessary to be very explicit on the first position.

If any man has a controversy with aught in the former essays of Christianos, the controversy must be with the scriptures, and not with the author of the essays; for he has assumed no position of his own: but his position is contained substantially in a fun-

dred passages of scripture; and most explicitly in this,—"I perceive of a truth that God is no respecter of persons; but that, in every nation, he that feareth Him and worketh righteousness is accepted of him."

Christians has made no draft upon the credulity of his brethren. It is *one thing* to assume a *position* no where to be found in the Bible, (as Universalists do for example,) and then go to the scriptures for proof; but it is *another* thing to find a position in the very words of scripture, and *show* that the doctrine, or sentiment contained in the position, is every where taught in the scriptures. And here let me turn and say to the thousands who are philosophizing upon the scriptures, You may shed great ingenuity, and learning too, in endeavoring to prove *your own positions* from the scriptures; you may ensnare the unwary by your wiles, and beguile the simple with your sophistries; but, as said Mr. Todd in his defence, "your subtle reasonings and ingenious pleadings will not be admitted at the bar of the final Judge." (I quote from memory, not verbally.) Be assured that the Prophets and Apostles have laid down their *own positions*, and have proved them. What folly do men impute to the sacred writers by the manner they study their writings! Can an audience cast greater contempt upon the intellect of a public speaker, than to inquire one of another, 'Can you tell what that man is endeavoring to prove?' Yet this is precisely the way that the Apostles and Prophets are treated. Their writings are read and quoted as if they were entirely random sayings; and men appear to think that they have a *perfect right* to twist and torture the holy scriptures, and make them speak *any thing* and *every thing* that the language is susceptible of. I think a British lawyer once said, if he were permitted to *cull* three sentences from the writings of any one of his contemporaries, he would, upon that authority, have him executed for *high treason*. Thus are the scriptures treated. Men rush upon the sacred pages with all their sectarian feelings and prejudices—with spirits unsanctified—with hearts impure—and passions unsubdued; little realizing that "the High and Holy One who inhabits eternity" is there speaking to them.

We again affirm, that the Apostles and Prophets assumed their own positions, and sustained them; and their writings can never, without the most daring irreverence and impiety, be taken to prove any position taken *out* of the Book. Of this kind is the doctrine, that "all men will be finally holy and happy"—of this is the doctrine that the soul sleeps, or perishes with the body—and, in fine, all the *distinguishing peculiarities* of all the different denominations. Hence there is not a text of scripture, from

Genesis to Revelation, that proves any thing, *pro* or *con*, about any one of these speculations, (unless it be in some sweeping general denunciation, as, "Fables, which turn away men's ears from the truth;" or, as "questions, which minister strife, rather than godly edifying.") But whither am I straying? Reader, pardon this digression.

To return: Christianos has said "he has assumed no position of his own:" indeed, he has nothing of his own, in religion, to prove. He wishes to know simply what the scriptures teach; and he wishes his brethren also to know. Our leading position is, in substance, on almost every page. It is distinctly stated in 2 Cor. viii. 12. "For if there be first a willing mind, it is accepted according to what a man hath, and not according to what he hath not." I know it is objected here that this is spoken of pecuniary contribution; but the principle contained in this sentence has characterized all the Divine proceedings in all ages of the world. It is a universal principle. Can any one suppose that our Divine Father has one rule for money matters, and another for moral matters? (Pardon the expression.) Those who think that "their money is their own"—that "they are accountable to no one for the use they make of their property"—that "the miser or the profligate may be a very good Christian"—those, I say, may well adopt this view: but those who believe that they are "stewards"—that they should "honor the Lord with their substance"—that "they are not their own, but are bought with a price"—those, I think, will not admit this view. No, indeed, it is the "willing mind"—the devotion of the whole heart, that makes *any* offering acceptable to the Lord—whether it be *money*, or the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or the performance of any other moral or religious duty. It was this (the devotion of the heart) that made the "two mites" of the poor widow as acceptable an offering to the Lord as was the munificent offering of king David, of "a hundred thousand talents of gold and ten hundred thousand talents of silver," (equal to about seven hundred and fifty millions of our money.) But I may be told that poison is *poison*, and that its effects would be fatal, although a man should honestly believe that he was taking a salutary medicine when he was swallowing it. True; but in morals it is the state of mind prompting to the deed that gives character to it, and not any inherent property in the action itself, (as will be abundantly shown hereafter.) The case of the Thessalian assassin (introduced in a former essay) is a strong one. He did for his intended victim an office of *kindness* that no *friend* could have done: his dagger, *aimed* at the heart, probed a deadly ulcer more skilfully than a surgeon's instrument; and thus he *saved* the life he purposed to *destroy*. But

did this take away the guilt of the action? Then, indeed, might Judas be commended for betraying his Master!! But I shall be told of the numerous chastisements that were brought upon the Jewish nation for single *acts* of disobedience. I shall be told that Aaron died in mount Hor in the wilderness, and Moses in the mountain of Abarim, for one transgression; yea, I shall be told that for one transgression it is said to David, "The *sword* shall never depart from thy house." To this I reply, that we should *regard* very differently the traveller who had been pursuing a plain beaten highway, and should perversely turn aside to wander in by-paths; and the man who in the darkness of night had *lost* his *way*, and was earnestly endeavoring to find it again: although in one prominent feature they are alike—they are both out of the way. Now the cases above stated are of the former class; and the scriptures furnish us also with numerous cases of the latter. Jehoahash, Amaziah, and Azariah, kings of Judah, were all reformers. They found things wrong, and labored to set them right. But they did not accomplish every thing. "The people still sacrificed, and burnt incense on the high places." (See 2 Kings, 12th, 14th, and 15th chapters.) Asa was a great reformer. It is said, (2 Chron. xv. 17.) "The heart of Asa was perfect all his days. Nevertheless the high places were not taken away out of Israel." Manasseh, also, although in the early part of his reign he committed every abomination,* yet "when he was in affliction he besought the Lord his God, and humbled himself *greatly* before the God of his fathers, and prayed unto him; and he was entreated of him, and heard his supplication, and brought him again to Jerusalem;" then, indeed, he set about reformation with all his powers, "and commanded Judah to serve the Lord God of Israel." "Nevertheless the people did sacrifice in the high places, *yet* unto the Lord their God only." (2 Chron. 33d chapter.) Now, legislation could not be more specific and positive than upon this subject. (See Deut. xii. 13, 14, and the whole chapter.) "Take heed to thyself that thou offer not thy burnt offerings in every place which thou seest: but in the place which the Lord shall choose, in one of thy tribes; there shalt thou offer thy burnt offerings, and there shalt thou do all that I command thee." But the strongest case is 2 Chron. 30th chapter, in the reform of Hezekiah, when he had proclaimed a solemn assembly. "So they established a decree to make proclamation throughout all Israel, from Beersheba even to Dan, that they should come to keep the passover unto the Lord God of Israel at Jerusalem; for they had not done it of a long time, in such sort as it was written." They came together

* Josephus says of him, "He barbarously slew all the righteous men who were among the Hebrews; nor would he spare the Prophets, for he every day slew some of them, till Jerusalem was overflown with blood." Book x. chap. 3. Antiquities of the Jews.

with great zeal; they destroyed the altars of idolatry, and were now to keep the passover." But "there were many in the congregation that were not sanctified." What was to be done with them? "For [verse 18] a multitude of the people, even many of Ephraim and Manasseh, Issachar and Zebulun, had not cleansed themselves"——"yet did they eat the passover *otherwise* than it was written." "But Hezekiah prayed for them, saying, The good Lord pardon every one that *prepareth his heart to seek God*, the Lord God of his fathers, *though he be not cleansed* according to the purification of the sanctuary.† But did the Lord hearken to this prayer? Yes, verily; (verse 20.) "And the Lord hearkened to Hezekiah, and healed the people." But the position, "The Lord looketh on the heart," is more than sustained. Any other view is as absurd and unphilosophical, as it is unscriptural. We esteem that monarch happy, and honorable too, who possesses the hearts—the affections of his subjects; but who envies the tyrant who is surrounded by trembling slaves and fawning sycophants? And what says the great King concerning those "who draw nigh to him with their mouths, and honor him with their lips, while their *hearts* are far from him"? We say that "the God of nature is the God of grace." Let us then look at nature: The genial influences of the sun are enjoyed not according to *state*, or *location*, but according to position, or inclination. The mountain, located far away, in the inhospitable regions of the North, which rears itself on high, and throws up its bosom to the sun, receives on its sunny side life and heat; whilst the mountain's side turned from the sun is bound in perpetual frost, *almost* under his vertical rays. Again, our hemisphere, during our summer, is so inclined as to receive the full force of the sun's rays; then it is covered with glory and beauty: but, anon, it is "*turned away* backward," and then the chilling blast and the desolations of winter succeed; although our earth is then three millions of miles nearer the sun than in summer.

Thus the Lord says of his ancient people, "They have turned the *back* to me, and not the *face*." I could multiply texts almost to infinity to justify these illustrations; but I forbear. There is no other criterion which will divide the human family into two classes as the scriptures do. With any other we must make instead of two, a thousand, or *perhaps* a thousand millions: but with the view before us all difficulty *vanishes*, even to the eye of philosophy. The man of a weak and uncultivated mind may have many faults and fall into many errors, and yet cordially hate sin and sincerely love the Lord. For such the Saviour has made gracious provision: "If thy brother trespass against thee

† Will not my brethren be as compassionate as this good king, and permit those whose hearts are prepared to seek God, to eat the passover with them, although they be not sanctified according to the law?

seven times in a day, and seven times in a day turn unto thee, saying, I repent, thou shalt forgive him. On the other hand," the man of a refined and philosophical mind may be free from *any* external fault, whilst his heart is as *cold*, and as *hard* too, as an "adamant stone." As quoted in a former essay, "It is the state of passionateness in the soul—not the thousand passionate acts."

On the highlands of the Western Reserve, which divide the waters running into the Ohio river from those running into lake Erie, there stood, a few years since, an old building, so situate upon the summit, that the rain which fell on one side was borne to the lake, and that which fell on the other was borne to "The Beautiful River;" yea, the kindred drops might fall so near together that they kissed each other by the way; yet a hair's breadth difference in their position might determine, with *unerring certainty*, that the one would be borne to the gulph of St. Lawrence, and commingle with the polar seas; while the other would, by the same law of gravitation, be carried to the great Mexican Gulph—to the regions of perpetual spring.

Reader, on which declivity art thou? If thou art on the wrong side, no matter how *near* thou art to the dividing line, thy doom is inevitable, unless thou dost repent. But, unlike the drops of water, thou choosest thy position, and canst change it. "Turn ye, turn ye; for why will ye die?" Receive the rays of the "Sun of Righteousness" into thy bosom; so shalt thou "rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory."

And to my brethren let me say, Be not exclusive; "examine yourselves;" "prove yourselves whether you be in the faith;" "be not deceived;" *it is not state, but character—it is not location, but position*, that is to decide our eternal destiny. There is animal and vegetable life in the regions of the polar bear, and there is perpetual frost and snow under a tropical sun—there are republicans in Europe, and there are tyrants in America—there are saints in Babylon, and hypocrites and sinners in Jerusalem. "Let him that *readeth* understand."

CHRISTIANOS.

REPLY TO CHRISTIANOS—*No. III.*

Brother Campbell,

Before I enter upon the admission of the sects, I must notice the case of Cornelius, so much relied on, and a few sayings of our friend.

What was the condition of the Gentiles? How were the Jews ever to know that they were *fellow-citizens by divine authority?* And how should we be certain of our right at this day to be called *Christians, and possess*

the Christian character, without this evidence which God gave to Peter and his Jewish brethren? Let us examine first what it was done for, and then show the errors contended for.

Cornelius, though a Gentile, was not ignorant of *Israel's Saviour.* "The WORD which *God sent unto the children of Israel,* preaching *peace* by Jesus Christ; (he is Lord of all;) THAT WORD, I SAY, YE KNOW which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, *after the baptism which John preached.*" Thus he was taught and believed *what was truth.* See Acts x. 36, 37. It was an exercise of the sovereignty of God, in giving his Holy Spirit to the *believing Gentiles in the same manner* as he had given it to the believing Jews. It was designed of God to *prohibit any man or set of men* from forbidding to a Gentile believer the water of baptism, as God had granted them repentance unto life. It is true the Jews arraigned Peter for having admitted them into the Christian kingdom. He appealed to the gift of the Spirit and tongues conferred on the Gentiles, as evidence "that God was no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that *feareth him* and WORKETH RIGHTEOUSNESS IS ACCEPTED WITH HIM." It was given to Cornelius and his household as a *witness* that they did believe; and he designed to put no difference between the Jew and the Gentile, or to bring them upon an *equality.* See Acts xv. 8, 11. A *witness* to whom? To the *Jews,* who were of opinion that God was peculiarly the God of the Jews, and that Christianity was a national religion. The Holy Spirit was to guide the Apostles into all truth; and the Gentiles' privileges are important items of revealed truth. The Holy Spirit was given before baptism: but such a gift is not now received before or after baptism; nor is it needed. He that says it is, let him prove it by the same evidence Peter produced to his Jewish brethren, and then, and not until then, will we believe it.* To quote this case to sustain any opinion of uninspired men, at this day, is a wresting the word of God from its object, which was to show he would elevate the *obedient believing Gentiles* to equal honors with the Jews, his peculiar people, in his spiritual kingdom.

Let us now show the errors contended for in the gift of the Holy Spirit to Cornelius. We say, "It was not given *before* faith, in order to *produce faith in their hearts.*" For the Holy Spirit was conferred upon both Jews and Gentiles when they *had believed* on the Lord Jesus. Acts xi. 17. It was not given to "*purify their hearts;*" for *God purified their hearts by faith.* Acts xv. 9. It was not given "*to save them;*" for they were to be *saved by words.* Acts xi. 14. It was not given "*in order to remission of sins;*" for that was through the name of Jesus. Acts x. 43. It was not given to them "*to reveal the gospel to them;*" for Peter was sent to tell

* Our friend says, "Cornelius realized the assurance of the Saviour." How? If a man is MINDED TO do his will, &c. There is no such text that I can find in the New Testament. It reads, "If a man WILL DO his will."

them the words of salvation which must be obeyed. Acts x. 48. It was no *"secret operation of the Spirit to enable Cornelius to believe the word of God;"* for he believed the message communicated by the angel, and the words spoken by Peter, before pouring out of the Holy Spirit. See the whole 10th chapter of Acts. Thus our friend's case, *"directly to the point,"* fails him. He will have a man a *Christian*, without any *scriptural evidence*, since the day of Pentecost, or setting up of the Christian kingdom, that *his sins are remitted.* Remember it is *through the name of Jesus* Peter taught Cornelius his sins were to be remitted. Now no man is authorized to put the name of Jesus upon sinners, but through faith in him, repentance towards God, and immersion into the name, &c. Paul has settled this question forever: "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." (How is this done, Paul?) "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female; for ye are all *one* in Christ Jesus; and if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to promise." It is painful to me to see this "positive ordinance" "undervalued" by our Baptist friends. It is equally painful to hear sprinkling called *baptism*, and made a Saviour to unconscious babes that cannot believe nor repent. We give to baptism no more than Jesus and his Apostles—that is, the institution appointed of God as the immediate evidence of the remission of our sins through faith in his name and the shedding of blood. We rejoice to say, we have never been treated by the Pedobaptists, or wicked men, as we have been by the Baptists, for believing in, and obeying the Lord Jesus Christ according to the plain *"letter" of his word.*

Our friend has said in support of *"his views"* that there are "Christians among the sects"—"there are many republicans in England and monarchists in the United States." Does this prove the republicans in England are *constitutional citizens of these United States?* If so, this would not prove that *teachers of Christiany* have a right to make *citizens of the kingdom of heaven according to their views.* "To the law and the testimony: if they speak not according to this (God's) word, it is because there is no light in them." See Isaiah, ch. viii. *"Bind up the testimony,* and SEAL THE LAW AMONG MY DISCIPLES." Whatever may be the *character* of a *foreigner*, he can never be a *citizen*, or inherit any real property, without *obeying* the *letter* of the constitution. To admit such to be *citizens*, without taking the oath as prescribed by the constitution and laws, is to make the constitution void—a useless—powerless thing. To admit that any men or women are Christians without immersion, whatever their characters may be, (and there are many valuable characters we cheerfully acknowledge,) is to lower down the divine standard, and make it just what our Baptist friends have it—a useless and powerless institution among themselves. There is no standard among them by

which a man can be *assured from the word of God his sins are remitted.*—There being *little, great, weak, strong,* and many other kinds of faith, *added,* leaves men and women *doubting* all the days of their lives whether they are "*Christians.*" *Repentance* being the work of every day, they are equally uncertain of their being *Christians.* But we have a *Thus saith the* SON OF GOD, "*He that believes and is immersed shall be saved.*" Thanks to him for such an institution, where all who WILL, CAN enjoy the same assurance, except those who have suffered the *decrees* and teaching of men to blind their minds.* All others, Christianos makes their '*ignorance*' as culpable as "*wilful disobedience.*" The case as quoted by him, proves this, in the death of Uriah, if his reasoning be correct.

But to my promise: Ask the Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Methodists if they do not believe their systems of faith and practice to be Christianity. They will answer, Yes. Take, for example, our Methodist friends: ask them if a man may not be a *Methodist,* and not a *Christian.* They will answer, Yes—"we take them on trial for six months." Ask them if a man can be a *Christian,* and not a *Methodist.* They will say, Yes. This admission, come from what *sect* it may, proves that system is not Christianity; for if Methodism (or any other *ism*) is Christianity, no man could be a *Methodist* without being a *Christian*—no man could be a *Christian* without being a *Methodist.* This is demonstration. Why, then, should any man contend for "Christians among the sects"? A Christian is a Christian, though he may not be as intelligent, obedient, holy, active, and useful as he ought to be. There are "little children," "young men" and "fathers" in the Christian kingdom.

Our friend intends, no doubt, to reprove us for "overvaluing" "positive ordinances." Are we not as *morally* bound to obey the "positive ordinances" as the law of Mount Sinai? We do not set aside moral obligations, nor "place them in *competition* with moral and devotional precepts. We contend for A REAL REMISSION OF OUR SINS, and A REAL SPIRIT OF HOLINESS, in order to our present salvation. *Faith* and *immersion* put us in possession of *this remission* as certainly as God is in heaven, or that Jesus Christ has visited and taught the sons of Adam. Then the Holy Spirit produces a real spirit of holiness in them that obey him. If this be to "undervalue" or "overvalue positive ordinances," we are ignorant of it, and ask him to teach us better. Yours as ever,

THOMAS M. HENLEY.

NO. IV.

Brother Campbell,

I MAY be asked by Christianos or some of his friends, What is the difference between us, seeing he makes "a man as truly culpable for voluntary ignorance as for wilful disobedience?" for he shows, he says,

* The Saviour says, "If the blind lead the blind, *both shall* fall into the ditch."—"In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Is not sprinkling, &c. commandments of men?

"that very state of mind that would prompt him to disobey, if his understanding were enlightened." In answer to this question I must say, The difference between us is as great as the difference between truth and error, or light and darkness. Although I cheerfully acknowledge the correctness of the above extract; yet I find Christianos does contend that the ignorance of some men and women sets aside, disannuls, or repeals what he calls "positive ordinances." He does make this ignorance, or "obeying in the spirit, and not in letter, as equally acceptable to the Lord as the most literal obedience." He also contends that the "unimmersed person is an acceptable worshipper of God." In so doing he makes a FOREIGNER A CITIZEN, an ALIEN A SUBJECT, without *obeying* those "positive ordinances." His quotations were all addressed to citizens of the kingdom of heaven; that is, those taken from the Apostles, except the case of Cornelius. I do say I am anxious, as multitudes of others are, that this matter should not be misrepresented, or smoothed over, or concealed from the eyes of all men. If the OPINIONS of Christianos are taught by Jesus Christ and his Apostles, I do most earnestly wish he could make it clear to every reader. If they are HIS OPINIONS, they are productive of more mischief than I fear he is aware of, and must involve him in a most responsible condition. Let us now come to close quarters, and probe them to the bottom. Is there any law in any civilized nation that makes allowance for the ignorance of some men, or passes over their transgressions under the plea of ignorance? In the *law of Moses* it is expressly stated, that if a priest, the whole congregation, a ruler, or one of the common people sin (only) somewhat against *any* of the commandments of the Lord concerning things which *ought not to be done*, and are guilty, he is a sinner, and he is required to offer sacrifice for this sin, and it shall be forgiven. Now mark it, "If a soul sin, and commit any of those things which are forbidden to be done by the commandments of the Lord, *though he wist it not*, yet is he guilty, and shall bear his iniquity." In the journeying of the children of Israel a man was found "gathering sticks" upon the Sabbath day. Even Moses and Aaron knew not at the time the punishment, much less this poor man. God commanded he should be stoned to death. "*One* ordinance shall be both for you and the congregation, and also for the *stranger* that sojourns with you, an ordinance for ever in your generations, so shall the *stranger be before the Lord. One law* and *one manner* shall be for you and for the *stranger* that sojourns with you." So speaks Moses. If men are *ignorant* of "what is truth," "who is the Christian," Christianos makes their "voluntary ignorance as culpable as wilful disobedience." The question hence arises, Who is the involuntary ignorant, or who is the cause of their being so by choice? I appeal to the *sincerity* of Christianos to say if it is not the professed preachers of the gospel that make any man or woman professing the Christian religion involuntarily ignorant of what God had commanded them to do?

Christianos speaks of "positive ordinances." I understand the word "positive" to mean *real, absolute*—the word "ordinance," *law*, or *rule*—that is, there are *absolute laws* in the gospel of Jesus Christ. Here we cordially agree. Now the difference between us is, he teaches this *absolute law* must yield to the ignorance of some, because they had teachers, or itching ears for such a teacher, as to turn away their ears from the truth. I contend and teach that the inspired Apostles and Evangelists are the teachers Jesus Christ commissioned and sent into the world for us to believe and obey; and all who are in search of the Christian character have, or can have these teachers; or that have an ear to hear, can learn what these "positive ordinances" are, and obey them.—If they will not, they have no right, title, or interest in the name or inheritance of the Christian.

It will not do to talk of "obeying in the spirit without the letter." This is separating asunder that which God has joined together—obedience to the letter. How does Christianos know a man obeys in spirit *without the letter*, these "positive" or absolute laws of heaven? This being MINDED TO DO, and *never doing*, the Saviour has decided upon. The case of the two sons who were commanded to work in their father's vineyard, one said he would not go, but afterwards repented and went. The other said I will go, and went not. Now the question is, "Whither of the twain DID THE WILL of his father? They answered, The first. Jesus says John came unto you in the way of righteousness [that is, baptizing for the remission of sins] and ye believed him not; but the publicans and harlots believed him, [that is, submitted to his baptism;] and ye, when ye had *seen* it, [that is, their baptism and reformation,] repented not afterwards, that ye might believe him." Thus stands the whole sectarian world. We are not surprised that a man should make the Saviour say, 'If any man is *minded to do*,' &c. what he never said. It runs in the *system* of mental speculating religion, and sounds well, and no doubt satisfies all the sects. If a man "is minded to" keep the commandments of Jesus, and never is immersed, or breaks the loaf *weekly*, or on every Lord's day, and does not worship him, he is as acceptable a worshipper as he that *does* keep his commandments. This is the teaching of Christianos. Before I close I will here state, that he makes this absolute law no law at all. Does he not know that no foreigner or alien can even possess or hold any real inheritance in these United States until he renounces all allegiance to every other prince or potentate on earth, and takes the oath of allegiance to the constitution of the United States and the laws of the state in which he intends living. See the case and Petition of Morris Pollok to our Legislature to pass a SPECIAL act in his favor to take possession of an inheritance he derived from his brother, without complying with the *letter* of the constitution. Is the covenant or constitution of man more consistent and absolute than the covenant or constitution of God?

Jesus taught, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled;" and "the scripture cannot be broken." Paul teaches, "If a *man's covenant* BE CONFIRMED, NO MAN disannulleth or addeth thereto." God gave Abraham a command —he had the right—and after proving Abraham, when he was *in the act* of giving the *last stroke*, did repeal this command. Jesus, our lawgiver, *alone* has the right to repeal or dispense with the obedience required.—Let it be shown he has done so; then, and not until then, can I admit an 'UNIMMERSED person,' at THIS DAY, 'is an acceptable worshipper of God," or that there are "Christians among the Pedobaptist sects." Let who will disannul or add to "the positive ordinances of God, I plead not guilty.

Yours, &c.

THOMAS M. HENLEY.

LETTER TO MRS. PHEBE CLAPP.

WELLSBURG, March 11th, 1839.

My ever dear Mother—

BY the return of my dear brother Thomas you have been informed of the sore chastisement with which I have been visited. This visit, at such a time, seemed an unspeakable blessing. He seemed to us as an angel of mercy. Our friends are doubly dear to us in times of our affliction. In this respect we were peculiarly blessed. We had the society, more or less, of all our dear friends in this region during the last illness of my beloved ALICIA. Indeed every thing the society and assistance of beloved relatives could contribute to smooth the avenues of life, she enjoyed. Yet little would this have availed her, and little would it have availed me, without the presence and fellowship of that "Friend which sticketh closer than a brother." His presence we realized. Blessed be his name!

When I think of the whole scene of my dear Alicia's last illness, I am compelled to exclaim with the Psalmist, "I will sing of *mercy* and of *judgment.*" The Lord dealt very mercifully with her. In the first place, she esteemed it a great cause of thanksgiving that she left the lake shore when she did, that she might have her mortal remains deposited by the side of her own beloved mother. Mother Campbell in her day had expressed a deep solicitude that all her children might be buried beside her. I know, my dear mother, that you regard the event of our leaving the beautiful shores of lake Erie in a very different light. You reason, that because we enjoyed uninterrupted good health while we remained there, that therefore we might have continued to do so had we remained there to this day. But surely this section of country is as *healthy* as that delightful land where you dwell. Besides, you will recollect that my dear Alicia expressed strong premonitions, before she left the lake, that she had not long to live. She thought the germ of a fatal disease was already within her vitals. It is surely most merciful to surviving friends to have warning given long beforehand of such an event. I had long since almost half relinquished the object of my affections; yet I little realized the parting pang, until, for the last time, I pressed her marble lips with mine. Then, indeed, I *felt* that we had parted never to

meet again "until the heavens shall be no more." but the blissful assurance I felt of a happy meeting with her in "that glorious," that "awful day," hushed all my murmurings, and mingled *joy* with my *grief*, and delight with my tears.

The whole period of her illness was marked by the most heavenly serenity of disposition, the most cheerful resignation to the will of our father in heaven. Her natural elasticity of spirit remained with her almost to the last. It was to the astonishment of all who visited her, that she seemed so perfectly raised above every earthly consideration. It was to me an unspeakable happiness that I was so freed from any worldly care, that I was permitted to spend my whole time in watching by her sick bed. I feel as though I had learned more of the character of the heavenly Father, and of my own character too, during that period, than I had learned all my life before.

Her beloved father visited her oft for the last two months of her life; and to you who know the almost exhaustless resources of his mind, his sympathetic heart, and his heavenly devotion, I need not describe the happiness we experienced in his visits. Her brother, too, on his long and perilous tour, wrote her once and again from the land "where the orange tree blows," letters full of consolation. She sometimes expressed almost a wish to remain until his return; yet would immediately deprecate the protracting of her life, knowing that in that event she must suffer great bodily affliction and distress during her long illness. "The law of the Lord was her delight and her meditation." She sought daily to examine herself in its light. In view of the exceeding greatness of the heavenly inheritance, she would sometimes exclaim, "Impossible that such treasures can be reserved for such unworthy creatures as we are!" The dying love of the Saviour was the theme on which she delighted to dwell. This chased away all her fears; this filled her with triumph. She saw and felt that the heavenly Father, in granting unto us "this unspeakable gift," had given us also the assurance that he would "with him freely give us all things;" that nothing could be too great for Him after that he had given his own Son. As her disease approached its crisis, its tendency was to induce apathy of mind. This was a great affliction to her. She used to reproach herself at times, in the severest terms, for the want of lively emotions of love and gratitude to Him who laid down his life for us "while we were yet enemies." It sometimes happened that during our evening devotions, after she became extremely weak, she would for a moment fall asleep. This was a great grief to her; but she would draw comfort from the compassionate apology of our Divine Lord for his disciples—"The spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak." For a length of time I used almost invariably to rise at midnight to inquire into her state and render any necessary assistance. At this time she was for an hour or two unusually wakeful; and we used always to unite in devotion at this time. These were seasons of great enjoyment to her. She suffered but little severe pain until the last four or five days of her illness; in which time she suffered much. She would then sometimes utter a groan; but would reprove herself for any thing that looked like complaining, by saying, "What is this compared to what the Saviour suffered for our sakes!" In the contemplation of the Saviour's love, death had, to her, lost all its terrors, and the grave its gloom. On the morning of the 16th of January when she found herself grappling with death, and already within his icy embrace, she said in a voice scarcely audible, "I suppose this is the *dark valley;*" "but," she added with triumph beaming in her eye, "we have the promise the Lord will be with us." Between the hours of 8 and 9 in the evening her spirit took its flight.

"At midnight came the cry,
"To meet thy God prepare!
"She woke and caught her Captain's eye;
"Then, strong in faith and prayer,
"Her spirit with a bound
"Burst its encumb'ring clay."

She smiled on death; and doubtless her disenthralled spirit, as it soared away, looked down with surprize upon the circle of friends as they stood weeping over her deserted "tenement." An angel smile still lingered on her countenance when her "eye was dark in death." Never before did I realize the words of the poet—

"Ah! lovely appearance of death!
No sight upon earth is so fair!"

But she is gone—and has left us to mourn and weep: yet we mourn not for *her*, but for ourselves: *she* has exchanged a cell of corruptible clay for celestial mansions. But when we think only of ourselves—when we look around on the circle she has left, we feel that a fearful breach has been made by her death. A dutiful and affectionate daughter—an amiable and beloved sister—a devoted wife—a tender and watchful mother, has been taken from us. But "the Lord gave, and the Lord has taken away; and blessed be the name of the Lord!" "O, Lord, teach us so to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom!"

"Waken, O Lord, our drowsy sense
To walk this dangerous road,
And if our souls be hurried hence,
May they be found with God!"

Farewell, my dear mother. May our Father in heaven bless you; and do not forget at the mercy seat your affectionate and bereaved son,

M. S. CLAPP.

LETTERS FROM A. CAMPBELL,

TO HIS SISTER DURING HER LAST ILLNESS.

The following two letters were written, as they purport, by the Editor, to his younger sister, *Alicia Anne Clapp;* who departed this life on the 16th of January, 1839, after a lingering illness, which she sustained with truly Christian fortitude and resignation. Her primary disease was dyspepsia, producing a sympathetic affection of the lungs. She cast all her cares upon the Lord; leaving her husband and two lovely children in the hand of Divine Mercy, expressing all assurance that the gracious Lord would provide for them. She yielded up her spirit in the blissful hope of an eternal life. "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord."

The second letter was not received (as indeed it was not written) until after the decease of the beloved sister. The letters are published in the absence of the Editor, without any authority from him. They were intended wholly as private property.

My dear sister Alicia—

By the late advices from home I have learned, with much sympathy, that your health has been gradually declining since I left. Of this I had some fears, mingled with the hope that I might be mistaken, when I was at Middleton; but it seems my fears were too well founded. It, however, very much mitigates the poignancy of this affliction, to learn that you are cheerful, patient, and resigned to the Lord's will. This is the sovereign specific for all the ills of this life. When our wills are absorbed and lost in the will of our heavenly Father, all is well:

"for then life or death is equal—neither weighs." This resignation throws a bright light over the darkest cloud that appears in our horizon, and calms every tempest that might arise in our hearts. "*Not my will, but thine be done*," was the secret of that heavenly peace, and that perpetual feast of the soul which was the joy of every sorrow in the life of our Redeemer.

"We glory in tribulations also," says Paul of his holy brotherhood. Why? Because tribulation worketh *patience*. And what is the use of patience? Patience worketh *approbation*. And what of approbation? Approbation worketh *hope;* and *this* hope maketh not ashamed, *because the love of God is poured out into our souls* by the holy spirit which is given unto us. Approbation, then, is the fruit of patience. We want our own *approbation:* it is worth more than the approbation of the world, or even of the church; for this approbation, which is the result of our patient waiting upon the will of God in affliction, inspires us with more confidence in the promises of God, which are as an anchor to our souls; and such an anchor we need in this world of change, and trial, and tempest. But how *rich* the promises! "I will never leave you nor forsake you!" Surely, then, we may say, "The Lord is our helper." How *faithful* too! Not one of them can be broken. God cannot lie. Two immutable things, we have his *promise* and his *oath*. May we not, then, have *strong consolation?* When a *Christian* sees time, life, death, and eternity in the light of Christ's gospel, how easy it is to *feel* right on all these themes. They are great themes, indeed. But when any one loves God, and Christ, and heaven supremely, and pants after the joys that are eternal, how easy it is to resign all we have on earth into the hands of Him we love most, and who loves us more than we do ourselves; and then patiently await his will. I therefore exceedingly rejoice, my dear sister, to learn how perfectly resigned you are to the issue of the present affliction. It is the greatest favor that God can bestow on you. In this way he will be your strength in weakness, your health in sickness, your joy in sorrow, your life in death, and your exceeding great and eternal reward.

To triumph over the fear of death, and to be resigned to it from principle, are victories which earth's mightiest sons have never yet attained. This is the fruit of faith: for who is he that overcomes the world, but he that believes that Jesus is the Christ of God? If I thought you had not the promises of Christ dwelling in you, I would seek to comfort you by a reference to them: but I bless the Lord that you know them and rejoice in them, and that you judge Him faithful who has promised. O! what it is to have such a *Saviour!*—one so wise, so powerful, so kind, so gracious, so condescending, so attentive to our every want—one who has trod the valley of affliction—who was, in all points, made like to us—afflicted, oppressed, and tempted in a thousand ways: one who entered the dark and dreary chambers of the dead, that he might take away the sting from death and victory from the grave. He has bowels of compassions and sympathies unknown to mortals. He loves us more than we love ourselves, and has done for us more than we either could or would do for ourselves.

"This is my beloved, and this is my friend, O ye daughters of Jerusalem!" Who in heaven can compare with the Lord! In heaven or on earth there is none that we can desire besides him. These, my

dear sister, I know are your views and feelings, and therefore I can be resigned with you and rejoice in the issue of this affliction. Indeed, it is they who *live*, and not they who *die* in the Lord, that most demand our cares, our sympathies, and our help. May the Lord strengthen and comfort your beloved husband, and administer to you and him out of his rich and abundant stores of grace and consolation such supplies as you may need! I cannot tell when I may return home: not before March, I think. I have yet some thousands of miles before me; and, although I cannot do much any where, I must attempt a little in many places. I think the Lord has blessed my labors hitherto, and I doubt not that he will still be with me. I am now where snows are seldom seen, and where winter is more like our April than any other time of our year. Lavinia joins with me in her most affectionate and sympathetic greetings, and desires to be remembered to you, and by you in your prayers.

I may yet see you in the land of the living; but I may not. We are both mortal. You are sick, and I am exposed to many perils. But however it may be with us here, we both hope and trust in the Lord, and expect to meet at his right hand in his everlasting kingdom. May the Lord bless you, and comfort you and your husband and children, and preserve you blameless till his appearing and his kingdom!

Ever yours in the joyful hope of eternal life, and most affectionately your brother, A. CAMPBELL.

My dear sister Alicia—

To-morrow we leave this city, and ascend the Mississippi, as far as Jackson, 165 miles. We have been 3000 miles since we left home in our journeyings hither, and are not much more than half round our circuit. We have our minds supremely set upon the end of the journey, upon the place called "home—sweet home." You, my dear sister, are thinking of the end of your weary pilgrimage, and of "the house not made with hands eternal in the heavens"—the "house of many mansions." What a delightful vision is a clear and cloudless view of the land that is afar off, on the other side of the stream of time! By the telescope of faith that land of rest and peace, of love and joy, is brought near, and can be distinctly seen even while in this valley of tears, and sorrows, and deaths.

I remember the last days—the solemn sweet evenings and mornings of my beloved Margaret's pilgrimage. She used to read the lives of the Bible saints by day, and to talk of their last hours and the incidents of their departure in the evenings, as the sun slowly sank beneath our lofty hills. We found in their history many a sweet theme—many a holy text from which to draw some consolation. For instance, while old Jacob was, with a Prophet's eye, pronouncing his dying benedictions on those around him—in the midst, as if too long abstracted from his meditations, he exclaims, "I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord!" So waited she for the Lord's deliverance. We have need of patient waiting on the Lord; for in these trials we are perfected, as Jesus was made perfect through sufferings. Still the thought that Jesus became a man of sorrows, and was made acquainted with grief—that he felt *as a man*, and was touched with a feeling of all our infirmities—that he

tasted death for us, and laid his head upon a rock of earth to make it soft and easy for us, is the ever-flowing spring of consolation and support to all his disciples when they are travelling the ways that lead to the grave.

How soon are over all the pains of expiring nature! and O how sweet the thought that the last agony is but our entrance into the porch of a life that neither fears nor feels mortality again! And, perhaps, we leave the world as we enter it, unconscious of the travail of a birth which changes but the state of our existence, and only introduces us to a world adapted to the life and nature which here we have acquired, through Him who is *the Resurrection and the Life.* For Jesus is our *life*, and his is an immortal life; therefore, he that liveth and believeth on Him shall never—can never die: and when Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then we shall appear with him in glory.

"A hope so great and so divine
May trials well endure,
And purify our souls from sin
As Christ himself is pure."

There is no balm, no consolation like the remembrance of the *love of God* in the gift of his beloved Son. Hence said Paul, "We rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have been reconciled to God." And we rationally conclude, that if God spared not his Son, but gave him up to the death for us, how can he—how shall he not with him also freely give us all things. Therefore, as sang the sweet Psalmist of Israel, "The Lord will withhold no good thing from them that walk uprightly:" "He will give grace, and he will give glory."

Reconciliation to God is every thing. His will is then our pleasure: his decrees our choice. To effect this God has done every thing: he has pledged his word, his promise, his oath, his Son; and, being persuaded of this, we cannot but delight in him. I need not, however, my dear sister, remind you of these things. You know in whom you have believed, and you are assured that he is able to keep that which you have committed to him till that day, that glorious day in which we shall all meet to part no more.

Whether I shall have the pleasure of seeing you on this side the river Jordan is to me all uncertain. The Lord has brought me here, and I cannot leave his work for some time: but should I not see you on this side the stream of time, I confidently hope to see you soon, where tears, and griefs, and pains shall be no more.

May the God of peace, that brought again from the dead the Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, stand by you, comfort, strengthen, and sustain you by his rod and staff! and may he who trod the valley of death for us be your light, your shield, your joy, and your strength, when all on earth must bid you adieu! And may he that does not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men, sustain your beloved husband, in this, to him, great affliction; and be the God and protector of your dear children! is the prayer of

Your sympathizing and affectionate brother,

A. CAMPBELL.

INCIDENTS ON A TOUR TO THE SOUTH.

NO. IV.

In the city of Augusta, Georgia, in the Episcopal Methodist meeting-house, on Saturday and Lord's day evenings, the 25th and 26th of November, we commenced our southern labors, and continued them in the Unitarian meeting-house daily for three successive evenings. The charity of our Methodistic friends, augmented as it was from the memory of the fact that the Baptists had opened their houses to the *Protestant* Methodists when excluded by them, extended to us the use of their meeting-house for three discourses—two on our first, and one on our second visit to that city. The Unitarian charity continued to the end of our third visit to Augusta. The Baptists and Presbyterians formally refused to permit us the use of their premises; and yet some of them imputed to us a leaning towards Unitarianism, because we occupied a Unitarian meeting-house! But as I said, if occupying a Methodist house did not make us Methodists, certainly the occupancy of a Unitarian meeting-house could not metamorphose us into Unitarians. The truth was, some pretext was wanting to sustain them before the public for condemning one whom they had not heard, and for reprobating that which they did not understand. The idle rumors on which some of them justified themselves, would have justified them from listening to Jesus Christ, the Apostles, and the reformers of every age. Jesus 'cast out demons by Beelzebub;' Paul affirmed that men 'ought to do evil that good might come, and that grace might abound;' and 'Luther was in league with the devil against the Pope,' if priestly reports were true.

We offered to the sects of the South a religion built on the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible; and none of the sects, as parties, would receive it. They would have a profession built on the Bible, and on something more or less than the Bible; but would not take the whole Bible, and the Bible alone. Some said they took the Bible, the whole Bible; but not one would say they would take the Bible alone. A creed, a book of discipline, some ecclesiastic formula they must have on the assumption that the Bible needed some such aid to adapt it to the present crisis. They admitted that while the church was pure, united, and happy, no other book was needed, and that no other book would be needed when Christians would again be united; but they contend that Jesus Christ did not provide for the present disjointed state of things, and that his Apostles left it to Doctors of Divinity to cure the diseases of Christendom by the patent specifics of their own sage inventions.

We found society in the South as we found it in the West some twenty years ago. The people are safely lodged in the hands of the priesthood; and, in a good measure, leave it to their pastors to feed them where and how they think best. They seem to think it is their duty to pay the pastors for thinking and praying for them, and that if the pastors do not do their duty they will have to answer for it; but the faithful people will be free. Of course there are a few honorable exceptions in all communities; but so far as I had opportunity to observe, there are fewer in the "far South" than in any other portion of the

United States that I have visited. Demagogues in religion and politics are a more respectable and influential class in the South than in the North. They are the sovereigns of the sovereign people. A southern politician dictates the policy of his constituents, and then having created them, he very agreeably represents them. Thus Mr. Calhoun having nullified South Carolina, admirably represents it. The great preachers follow the great statesmen, and having nullified the investigation and election of the people, dictate to them what they ought to think, believe, and do. Newspapers, magazines, and periodicals of every description are less common in this population than in any other American community. A cotton-growing people are not necessarily a reading people: hence education is at a very low ebb in the South. I learned from the most respectable sources that a large proportion, say one half of the poor white population, cannot write, and many of them cannot read. Legislative provision has been made, and is making, to relieve these misfortunes; but they are, in my judgment, incurable. Plantations are generally large—from one to ten thousand acres; the poor spots are left for the poor people; and they live so far apart, or so few in one settlement that they cannot have schools, or send to them. An aristocracy of wealth fosters an aristocracy of learning; hence the South boasts of a few great men. But one of these great men costs more than a thousand little men. He lives on five or ten thousand acres, has from 100 to 500 slaves to work for him: and thus represents the mind, learning, and wealth of some hundred *white* men, a single remove from absolute ignorance and pauperism, for every ten men in comfortable circumstances.

I do not approve of the darings of those tourists from distant and foreign lands, who profess to delineate the manners, customs, and character of a state from the opportunities which a transient visit or a hasty tour affords. It is impossible to be accurate or just in such representations. Years of intimate sojourning are requisite to such an undertaking. I do not presume to such a task. I have inquired into two or three matters of this sort; and have merely observed all that came under my view, and believe that I am substantially correct in these conclusions and remarks. I am convinced that more than half the white population of the Carolinas and Georgia are an age behind the same class in the West and North of our national patrimony. And still worse, I am of opinion that their condition can never be improved under the institutions of those regions. It is of the essence and of the tendency of those institutions to concentrate all power, wealth, learning, and respectability into the hands of an elect few—peers of the realm, princes, and nobles of the land—"Lords of the fowl and the brute."

The good citizens of the South, amongst whom are many excellent and choice spirits, are not to blame for these institutions. They did not create them. They are themselves the creatures, not the creators of those institutions. They were born and educated under them, and cannot be blamed for the vices of a dominant majority, when they do not countenance them. It is of the essence of our nation that the minority shall submit to the majority in all things temporal and political:—things spiritual and eternal are always excepted. This state of things is, however, very favorable to those who assume to be priests

and lords over God's heritage, and exceedingly adverse to all sorts of reformers, religious or political. An ignorant people are generally fond of mysteries,—prone to enthusiasm, superstition, and man-worship—greatly attached to their leaders, and reluctant to assume the toil or the responsibility of personal examination. Hence we found it difficult to create an interest in behalf of Bible reading and examination, or of a Christian profession which is founded upon the *knowledge* of God and of Jesus Christ our Lord. A cheaper and more popular religion was in the market, and one that greatly subserved the worldly interest of its zealous advocates. To be converted by a dream, an impulse, a sermon—by some divine and mystic influence, without any reading, meditation, or previous information; and that, too, to a *profession* that is both honorable and sometimes lucrative, especially in towns and villages, is much more consonant to our carnality and selfishness, and has many more temporal claims upon the community than one wholly spiritual and divine, which calls for much reading, examination, and personal consecration to the truth, and proposes its riches and its honors in another and a future world.

From Augusta, accompanied and helped forward on our way by our good brother Dr. Erwin, we crossed the Savannah river, and proceeded to Erwinton, in Barnwell District, South Carolina. The first evening on our way we partook of the hospitalities of Dr. Bailey. Erwinton is the residence of General Erwin, who first introduced the Millennial Harbinger into the lower part of South Carolina. He received us into his spacious and elegant mansion, with all the courtesy and hospitality of a southern planter, and made us feel perfectly at home during our peregrinations in the Barnwell District. A little neucleus, composed primarily of Dr. Erwin, his amiable consort, and sister Robert, the wife of Captain Robert, than whom we found no man more friendly and devoted to our interests in all the South; yet only a proselyte of the gate: I say, a little neucleus in favor of reformation had here been formed by the proscriptions of the Baptist church of that vicinity. These were the first fruits of that region, occasionally watered by the faithful Ephraim A. Smith and brother J. M. Barns. The Baptist church of Smyrna, contrary to the decrees of the Savannah River Association, to which it belongs, opened for us the doors of its commodious meeting-house, distant from Erwinton only five miles; and for three successive days we spoke to the brethren and friends that assembled there.

Elder Green, now in charge of this congregation, is not a common man, nor a common Baptist preacher. A sermon recently delivered by him, and published in pamphlet form, on John xx. 30, 31., showing why the gospels were written, is worthy of all Baptist acceptation, and does great credit to the good sense and piety of its author. "More noble than those in Thessalonica," many of this community "received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures whether these things were so." After having scattered the seed here for a few days, intending to return again, we set out for Savannah, Ga., accompanied by Capt. Robert, his amiable nieces, sisters Robert and Cole, and brother E. A. Smith. The first evening we partook of the hospitalities of brother Robert, of the vicinity of Robertville, and the next evening arrived at 9 o'clock in the old city of Savannah.

Early in the morning we were taken from the hotel to our good brother Dunning's, who received and lodged us as they were wont to do in ancient times. A little church, of about twenty members, meets weekly in that city in honor of the death and resurrection of the Messiah. Brother Dunning is one of the most uncompromising men in the world. He goes for the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, in all matters of Christian faith and manners, and is accredited by all men as an unexceptionable Christian; save that, as was said of some of the old Baptists, he is apt "to cram a text of scripture down the throat of any man that accosts him on the subject of religion;" and sometimes he scarcely waits to be importuned on the subject. So say his opponents.

All meeting-houses were shut against us in the city of Savannah, save the Unitarian. The heterodox are more liberal than the orthodox. So I have found them from Boston to Savannah. They permitted me, both in Augusta and Savannah, boldly to avow my sentiments in oppotion to their Unitarianism, and to proclaim my views without restraint. We delivered five discourses in Savannah, and had a fair and attentive hearing.

The church met in a private house, after night, on the Lord's day, to break the loaf. We had a comfortable meeting. A brother Harris, a Baptist minister of high commendation for moral worth, from a Georgia Association, who heard our discourses in Savannah, came and partook of the Lord's supper with us, and is now about being cast out of the Baptist sect for this high offence. It is also, I learn, alleged against him, that he was seen walking in the street with brother Dunning! So Paul was beaten by the Jews because they had seen Trophimus walking with him in the temple; but the Baptists beat Trophimus, and let Paul escape.

There is a *colored* church in Savannah, which counts some 1800 members, under the pastoral care of brother Andrew Marshall, a man of color. This worthy man, who, after buying his wife and all his children, and giving 600 dollars for himself after he was 50 years old, is now worth some 20,000 dollars. I am told that, though *eighty-one* years old, he is, in truth, the ablest and best preacher in Savannah. I had the pleasure of an interview with him; and, from all that I could learn from him and others, I conclude that he takes more care of his flock, and has them in better condition, than any other Baptist Pastor in the country. He has been much persecuted, shamefully persecuted, because he was said to be tinctured with something nicknamed "Campbellism." But no man or set of men has been able to put him down. He looks as though he might yet live forty years: a Moses in point of constitution. Take him all in all, he is an honor to the race to which he belongs.

From Savannah, accompanied over the river by our good brother Dunning, with whom we parted in primitive style, and conveyed in his carriage to Capt. Robert's, a distance of 75 miles, brother Smith and myself returned to Erwinton. The rest of our company ascended the river in a steam-boat. Next day my appointment was 23 miles distant, at the Capital of the Barnwell District, where, at 2 o'clock P. M., and at 7 P. M. I addressed an attentive audience in the Court-House, and partook of the hospitalities of Col. Brown, one of the deacons of the

Baptist church. Next day, at 11 A. M. we addressed rather a Presbyterian congregation at the Boiling Spring, midway between Erwinton and the Court-House, and dined with Mr. Hay, the proprietor of the springs, and a very respectable number of the Presbyterian community. This is an interesting place, having a neat little Presbyterian chapel in sight, whose doors were shut while we addressed the open ears of nearly all its members in the Academy House, distant only a few hundred yards. How much more dangerous to the walls of a meeting-house than to the ears of its owners, are the words of reputed heresy! Surely the word of man is more puissant than the word of God, if, without any supernatural aid, it can deceive the very elect supernaturalists themselves!

On the 15th and 16th we had an appointment at the Methodist meeting-house, at Swallow Savannah, about 5 miles from Erwinton. This was obtained through the liberality of our friend Mr. Powel, a local preacher of that order, and one of our constant readers. Parson Wade, also, a very liberal and opulent Methodist preacher, of Georgia, and some others whose names are not known to us, were in attendance. Our Baptist brethren of Smyrna were generally present. At the close of this meeting four persons came forward to confess the Lord—three of whom were that same evening immersed. During the evening we sojourned with our kind host Capt. Robert, whose indefatigable attentions to our comfort will long be remembered, and early on Monday we departed from Erwinton for the northern and mountainous part of South Carolina. On our return we spent one evening with Capt. Bush, at whose house, next morning, at 10 o'clock, we addressed a large assembly standing in the open air—a Baptist meeting-house, being almost in sight, built on the land, and much at the expense of our worthy host, was shut against its owners. In South Carolina and some other places the people act as though meeting-houses were built for preachers rather for the owners of them. They shut themselves out of their own houses for the sake of keeping the pulpit pure from heterodoxy.

On the evening of the 18th we again returned to Augusta, and to the residence of our very kind hostess sister Tubman; whose mother, the amiable sister Thomas, from Frankfort, Ky., we happily found convalescing from a dangerous cold, occasioned, as we feared, by her attendance at our meetings; for in the South meeting-houses are generally without stoves, and many of them without windows. This is one of the greatest "*crosses*" which Southern Christians have made for themselves. I have spoken in some Baptist meeting-houses on the present tour, in which there are members said to be worth from 100,000 to 500,000 dollars, living in splendid mansions, and "*worshipping*" in a house merely weather-boarded, without windows and without stoves, and almost without doors. They may be good summer-houses, but certainly they are not adapted to Southern or Northern constitutions in the winter-months.

We addressed, that same evening, a very respectable and attentive audience in the Methodist meeting-house in Augusta, and having some appointments for the 4th, 5th, and 6th of January, on the morrow we departed in company with our much esteemed and beloved brethren Barnes and Rucker, of Georgia, who had very kindly brought his carriage to Erwinton to carry us to our appointments in the upper parts of Carolina and Georgia.

On our way we addressed the citizens of Abbeville District, S. C., in their Court-House; and also spent one evening with a good Baptist brother, Major Broyle, who immediately despatched all hands over the country, and gathered up, in two hours, a respectable congregation in his own house. He thinks for himself; and having built for the Baptists a synagogue, if I mistake not, before he was a member, he is deservedly high in their esteem. They do not, however, allow him to use the house which he gave them as seemeth good in his sight.

Next day, after riding 16 miles, we addressed the brethren of Greenville District, in their own house. The weather was exceedingly cold for this climate, and the house being unfinished, the meetings on Saturday and Lord's day were not well attended. The church here counts some forty members.

Ten miles distant is the beautiful village of Greenville the residence of our zealous and amiable brother Williams, with whom we spent three or four very agreeable days while we addressed the citizens of the seat of justice for the district, in the Baptist public meeting-house. The mountain scenery around and remote from this village is exceedingly beautiful, and even magnificent. The Table Mountain, some 1500 feet high, is in sight. and other picturesque and grotesque peaks and ridges, variegate the highly interesting and diversified landscapes on the mountain sides of this healthful and inviting town. We had an attentive and constantly increasing audience during our five discourses in this place, and had the pleasure of seeing the ice of an unusually cold Christmas day, in this lofty and cold region, broken by our warm-hearted brother Barnes, for the immersion of our intelligent and amiable Presbyterian hostess, Mrs. Williams, and one of our old readers, now brother M'Clenaghan.

On the 29th we set out for Anderson District, though last mentioned, not least of the cantons of the South countries: for there was the first reader of our works in the state of South Carolina. Then Captain, now brother Earl, of that district, in the days of the "Christian Baptist," found in it that which happened to have previously filled his views of New Testamentism. His truly amiable and intelligent lady, sister Earl, had been introduced to us at Greenville on the 22d, while she was in attendance at our two days meeting there. On our way to Evergreen, the residence of the first fruits of South Carolina, we spent an evening at Anderson Court-House, where we had the pleasure of first seeing our excellent brother Earl.

At the importunity of our friend Elder Vandiver, of the Baptist brotherhood, one of our regular readers, we consented to address such an audience as could be convened that evening in the inn where we lodged—our appointment being on the next day for that village. A respectable audience was immediately convened, and we addressed them. The next day, though very cold and without fire, we addressed a deeply attentive audience in the Baptist meeting-house. Our friend Vandiver having not merely announced our meetings, but requested his people to attend, we had as large congregations as the season would allow. Having been somewhat proscriptive, and perhaps too highly Calvinistic, our friend who favored us with a good deal of his company, is gradually relaxing and softening down, and exhibits a good degree of seeming candor, though it is doubtful whether he may live so long as to outlive all his Baptistical traditions and opinions.

A deep snow and very cold weather greatly interfered with our meetings at Evergreen, where we spoke only three discourses—one on Saturday and two on Lord's day. On Monday morning, decidedly the coldest we had felt this winter, we again met with our friend Vandiver at the water, where a young lady (sister Hammond) was immersed: after which we bade each other a friendly adieu.

Brother Moor, of Evergreen, once a Methodist preacher, of good reputation, fell in with us on our way from Abbeville to Greenville. He accompanied us for several days. His wife, a descendant of the royal house of the Stuarts, whose grand-father to the age of 115 kept the lineage of his descent, has made herself more honorable than her royal ancestors by becoming a daughter of the King of kings, and an inheritor of the kingdom that is celestial and eternal. Brother Moor has it in his power to do much good, as a skilful and impressive proclaimer of the word, and I am persuaded fails not in disposition and determination.

Brother Shehane has become the sole editor and proprietor of the "Watch." He had need of the eyes of an Argus to guard the cause of reformation in the South from the insidious attacks of its numerous opponents. He is in bad health, and therefore we enjoyed his company only while we tarried under the hospitable roof of brother Earle. If our young editors will keep to the text of reformation, and not seek to distinguish themselves by some fine discovery, or new and brilliant theory of religion, of God or man, they will do well for the cause, and save themselves from many a bitter pang. We want many tons of practice, and not one ounce of theory. We need much reformation of morals—of behaviour; much more bibleism, and less man-ism; many preachers in word and practice—preachers of first principles—preachers of the gospel: a few *scribes* will suffice. May the Lord watch over the watchmen, and save the editors from speculation, contention, and egotism!

From Evergreen, after commending one another to the Lord, we visited Ruckersville, Georgia, and spoke to the citizens of that place. Having enjoyed the hospitalities of our senior brother Rucker, of the Baptist church, we made a visit on a special call to Elberton, the capital of Elbert county, and there addressed an intelligent and most attentive audience. We spent that evening most agreeably with the very accomplished family of Gen. Harris, whose domestic attachments have kept him from the bustle, contention, and strife of the political arena. His great attention and devotion to the family circle and domestic relations—to "*home, sweet home*," have given him a perfection rarely attained in the art of making his society and hospitality peculiarly acceptable to all his guests.

The next evening, being belated, we sought and we enjoyed the hospitality of Mr. and Mrs. Rembart; and on the 4th, accompanied by brother Earle, and our zealous, ardent, and devoted brother Barnes, we returned to Augusta, and found all things well. We again addressed the citizens in the Unitarian meeting-house, on the 4th, 5th, and 6th of January; after which, a few of us having assembled at 9 o'clock P. M. at the house of sister Tubman, we broke the loaf of blessing, and commending one another to the Lord, we separated. On the morrow, very early in the morning, we departed, our beloved brother Ephraim having seen us into the rail cars for Warrenton, Georgia. In sixty hours

staging and fifty miles rail-road, we arrived at Montgomery, Alabama, situate on the beautiful river which has given a name to the state, distant from Augusta about 320 miles.

Before leaving the brethren in Augusta, it was agreed by them, in conjunction with other brethren in South Carolina, that brother Barnes should itinerate the current year in the two states, spending half his time in Augusta. Our good brother Dr. Hook, in connexion with the few that have agreed to keep the commandments of the Master in that city, might be more useful were it not that he is so deeply, and perhaps necessarily involved in the business transactions of this life. The people of the South are so accustomed to be led by political and religious preachers, that none but preachers can save them from being the slaves of men for ever. A. C.

News from the Churches.

Adams county, Illinois, October 19, 1838.

Through the tender mercy of our heavenly Father I am still preserved, and again take my pen in hand to give you a detail of a very pleasing and heart-cheering meeting that was held on Bear creek, Adams county, commencing on the Friday before the first Lord's day in September last, and continued until the Tuesday evening following. There was assembled together a number of brethren and sisters from various parts of the country, who appeared really to enjoy a feast in a reciprocal exchange of views and feelings while thus communicating their thoughts one to another—while their prayers and songs resounded to the God of all grace for the rich blessings attendant on obedience to the gospel. There were ten who made the good confession, and were immersed into Christ for the remission of sins during the meeting; while the word of truth appeared to pierce the hearts of many who are to all appearance so infatuated with sectarian notions that they hesitate to confess their Lord and Saviour. There were also some two or three added to the number of the brethren by restoration, and one from the Baptist ranks. I have visited the brethren once since that time, and learned that three others had made the good confession. After laboring and toiling in this frontier country for nearly seven years, with but small success, my heart is at last made to rejoice at the present prospects in our country. May this wilderness indeed rejoice and blossom as the rose! The harvest is great, but the laborers are few. Will some of our dear brethren, who are laboring in word and teaching, favor us with as many visits as possible? Their services would be thankfully received, and I feel confident that the brethren would sustain them.

We had at the above named meeting, who labor in word, brethren David Hobbs, Henry Cyrus, —— Knox, E. Johnson, and G. R. Turner, the most of whom are young brethren; but I feel certain that they will all soon become able proclaimers of the gospel of our blessed Saviour. JOHN B. CURL.

Middleburg, Ohio, October 27, 1838

I have just returned from a co-operation meeting, at Kenton, Hardin county, at which brother William Bowling was appointed an Evangelist for the ensuing year. Seven were added to the congregation at Kenton. This congregation, though but very young, now numbers nearly 80 members, most of whom were added during the last year. On the 2d Lord's day in this month I held a meeting at Cherokee, Logan county, at which 4 were added—two from the Baptists and two by immersion. There is a congregation near this place (Cherokee) formed last month, now numbering from 20 to 25, two-thirds of whom are from the United Baptists. Prospects are indeed good every where. If the brethren would avoid "*foolish questions*" and attend to the living oracles, truth must and will prevail. J. B. FERGUSON.

☞ The Editor has just returned to his chair, from a tour of almost six months.—Many documents on file will receive attention as prompt as possible.—The Baptist Banner has denied, it is said, the truth of our statements concerning Mr. Fisher. Will the Banner send us those papers that speak of this matter, that we may examine on what authority he dares to deny a fact so palpable? A. C.

ERRATA.—Page 118, 10th line from bottom, for "logical parable," read *logical puzzle*. Same page, line 6th from bottom, for 'absurd" read *absurd*.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME III.——NUMBER V.

BETHANY, VA. *MAY*, 1839.

INCIDENTS ON A TOUR TO THE SOUTH.

NO. V.

No sooner had we arrived at Montgomery, Alabama, than we were met by brother Butler, so well known to our brethren as the herald of reformation in this state. He was accompanied by brothers Kelley, of Haynville; Duckworth, of Dallas; and Lavander, of Illinois—men of high reputation among the brethren. Brother Davis, of Montgomery, also met us in the spirit of the gospel on our arrival in that city.

The Presbyterian, Methodist, and Baptist meeting-houses were shut against us, and the people cautioned against our heresy. Next morning, January 10th, we addressed a considerable collection of gentlemen in the court-house. We had concluded to make no farther effort to be heard in that city; but, on motion of Mr. J. E. Belser, Editor of the "Montgomery Advertiser," and Judge Martin, friends to free discussion and gentlemen of liberal minds, a second appointment was made. Through the activity of these gentlemen, the citizens, gentlemen and ladies, turned out *en masse* on the same evening, until there was no room to contain them, in vindication of themselves from any concurrence with the rulers of the synagogues, who had presumptuously locked the doors of the people's houses against their proper owners. We were much importuned to tarry with them; but our appointments ahead constrained us reluctantly to leave on the next day. Accompanied with those brethren, and helped forward on our journey by them, we visited Hayneville, where we spoke twice; and Mount Willis, where we spoke once in the Baptist meeting-house, with the consent of brother Lee, the Elder of the church. At Bragg's Store, we also spoke on the Lord's day in the Baptist meeting-house, called New Bethel;—the same evening at Carlowsville, Lowndes county, in the house

usually occupied by the intelligent and liberal Elder Hartwell, of the Baptist church;—on the County Line, on the 14th, we also delivered a discourse in the Baptist meeting-house;—and again, on the same evening, at the house of brother Randal Duckworth, of the Baptist church. Next day we also addressed a congregation assembled in the Baptist meeting-house, near Portland, called Mount Pleasant; and again returned to enjoy the hospitalities of our good Baptist host, brother Duckworth.

In all these places we had as good a hearing as could have been expected under all the circumstances; and we scattered the seeds of reformation with as liberal a hand as possible for the time we occupied. Under the conduct of our indefatigable and truly magnanimous brother Butler, we passed a few days very comfortably in the state of Alabama, not only enjoying his hospitality and kind assistance on our journey, but also the hospitality of his fellow-citizens and brethren wherever we went; amongst whom we will long remember Francis Boykin, Esq., of Dallas, and brother Duckworth, of the same vicinity, and their intelligent and amiable consorts; who, though members of the Baptist church, not only extended to us their hospitalities, but furthered our course in our journeyings in the publication of the word of reformation through their state. We had the pleasure also of spending part of a night with Mr. Bissel and his amiable lady, after having been almost cast away and benighted in one of the darkest and most rainy nights we have met with, some of our company having been out till midnight, about five hours in travelling two or three miles. We had an appointment in Carlowsville, which we were hasting to fill, while we were overtaken in the pitchy darkness of a tempestuous night. By the aid of a flambeau, we, in the van of our company, reached the spot in time to speak an hour to an attentive audience. The rest of our company with brother Butler, not having yet arrived, messengers were despatched in quest of them. They had sat for some two or three hours in their carriage on the side of a hill, unable to escape from the difficulties around them. There they stood, in *dubiis rebus*, with "scotched" wheels, in a deep gloom, irradiated only by an occasional flash of lightning. In this imminent slough of despondency they waited for some star of hope, till despair itself had seized the reins, and for some time held them fast against the efforts of four relief mules superadded to the original team, which rather held them from backsliding, than facilitated their onward march to the desired villa. They were finally rescued from the dangers of their unenviable position, and on the next day were ready for the next station.

We parted with our much esteemed and beloved brother Butler on the morning of the 16th January; and being conveyed to

Portland by brother Duckworth in one of the carriages which had transported us some 80 miles through the counties of Montgomery, Lowndes, and Dallas, we embarked on board the Tapaloosa, for Mobile, some 400 miles down that river, where we safely arrived in about 40 hours. We continued in Mobile for three or four days, and sailed thence on board the Giraffe, a splendid and sea-worthy boat, by the way of the Gulf of Mexico and Lake Ponchartrain, to New Orleans; at which place we arrived after a pleasant and safe voyage, on Tuesday morning, the 22d inst.

During our stay in Mobile we spoke but twice—once in the court-house, and once in the Unitarian church. Young Mr. Boykin, son of brother Boykin, of Dallas, kindly undertook to obtain a meeting-house from some of the sects; but finding them more sectarian than he imagined, we were constrained to appear as aforesaid. We had, however, a very good hearing in that city, many more having assembled than could possibly be accommodated even with a place to stand.

The state of things in Alabama is not, indeed, very flattering to the Christian preacher. Fortune-making is the one thing needful. It is the mania of the whole South. A worldly spirit and the Holy Spirit are as antipodal as heaven and earth. "No man can serve God and Riches;" and therefore all those who are vainly striving to serve both are spoiling both, and serving neither. There is no cure for this disease but conversion to God. "To be carnally minded is death: to be spiritually minded is life and peace." A person with his soul fixed on cotton and Negroes, on lands and tenements, is as unfit for heaven as heaven is unfit for him—unfit for heaven as leviathan for the clouds, or an eagle for the depths of the sea. Cotton, land, and Negroes are not among the joys of heaven, nor the beatitudes of the happy.

The Baptists in Alabama have been somewhat leavened with the doctrine of reformation, principally through the great liberality of brother Butler, who has dispersed thousands of dollars worth of books and pamphlets among that community and their friends, superadded to his own labors, and those of brother Graham and others. Many of the preachers are, as we learned, a sort of *days men*, half-way reformers, *formally* opposing, but *really* teaching the doctrine on various grand subjects of Christianity. This is an uncandid and unchristian course, and the Lord will not thank them for such services. There is, on the whole, a manifest misgiving in the confidence of multitudes in the doctrines, usages, and customs of the Baptist, as in those of other communities. But the want of biblical knowledge is so general, that little can be expected, until the people learn to read the Bible.

They have no measure, rule or standard by which to ascertain what is truth. Many prove and approve what they now hear, by what they have heard. Like Mary Simple, they prove what mother said by what the preacher says; and then prove what the preacher says by what mother said. The notion that men are regenerated without the word, is the parent of all this apathy about the knowledge of God and of Jesus Christ. I say, the notion that men are regenerated *without the word*; for this was the doctrine of the Baptists till very recently, and it still is the doctrine of many of them. The present heads of families were generally educated under the theory of waiting for God's time to come, and therefore they train up their children as themselves were trained—without the knowledge of the Bible.

In some places we find an eager desire on the part of the Baptists to amalgamate the doctrine of the restoration with their Fullerism, Gillism, or Calvinism. It will not do. "No wise man putteth new wine into old leather bottles, nor a patch of new cloth upon an old garment." The new wine of the gospel will burst the old bottles of St. Austin, or St. Chrysostom. Let them keep their Baptist wine in Baptist bottles, if they wish to preserve their bottles. Those *would-be* reformers of the Baptists, who seek to stay among them and gradually imbue them with the doctrine of reformation, most generally become old pitchers, to be placed on their sideboards, or mantle ornaments, like Dr. Johnson of South Carolina. The Baptists keep them quiet by throwing them a bone to pick; meanwhile the sheep and lambs are saved from greener pastures, cooler shades, and more limpid streams.

It will not do. We must come out from among them that will not obey God rather than man. The Lord's commandments are not kept in any sect built in whole or in part upon any human creed. The Baptist society, like all other societies, has some excellent spirits that would do honor to the Christian profession, if placed in circumstances favorable to the culture and development of the Christian graces. But one might as rationally look for tropical plants in Siberia, as expect a growth in grace and in the knowledge of God and Christ and eternal life, under a monthly sermon from the fourth part of a verse, in some figurative or symbolic passage, which only serves as an occasion for the preacher to tell his dreams; or to retail, under new labels, the obsolete and musty theology of days of darkness long since enrolled with years beyond the flood.

The whole economy of religious administrations in South Alabama is at fault. The house for meeting in, and the conduct of the meetings in those houses—the preaching, and the praying, and the singing, and all the rest greatly need reformation. This

can only be effected by a more intimate acquaintance with the Bible; but this acquaintance will never be formed through the instrumentality of the present Baptist ministry. The people must read, examine, and think for themselves, or remain where they now are to the day of eternity.

New Orleans, but for its unhealthy clime and the fickleness of the Mississippi, would be one of the greatest cities in the world. It sits upon many waters, and is nourished by the richest vallies in the world. But the king of rivers, in his freakish moods; has given some hints already that he would as soon disembogue his riches by the channel of the ancient Atchaffalaya; and, by thus shortening the distanse some three hundred miles, and giving a more healthy site for a city, confer still greater favors on the millions that in future times will cultivate and people the ten thousand hills and vallies that altogether make the unmeasured valley of the Mississippi.

New Orleans much exceeded our expectations. We found its streets, its pavements, its architecture, and especially its police, greatly in advance of our previous information. True, indeed, the French part of the city is neither eminent for beauty nor convenience. It resembles views of parts of the ancient cities of Paris, Lyons, or Marseilles a century ago. But the American portions of this great emporium are after the model of our eastern cities, improving both in convenience and elegance. The police is, indeed, better than that of any eastern city, not only in our estimation, but in that of gentlemen from all parts of the Union; and it gives me pleasure to say, that in the esteem of all who know it, it has greatly improved in its moral character ever since the visitation of the cholera. Still the Lord's day is more desecrated in New Orleans than in any city I have ever visited. Not only the French Theatre, but even the American Theatre is open every Lord's day evening; and with shame be it written, the American Theatre is said to be better attended than the French—and that, too, by our own population: for many of the sons of the Puritans can do in New Orleans what neither they nor their fathers would, or could do at home. The business of the South is generally done by Northern men; and especially is this true of New Orleans. Hence they have it in their power greatly to improve the moral as well as the commercial character of this great emporium. But while they go for fortune, and the natives for pleasure, and a mixed population for both, the cause of moral and religious improvement cannot greatly advance from its present low and inoperative character.

We found our friend Mr. Clapp, Pastor of the First Congregational Church, as liberal, familiar, and courteous as we had expected from our epistolary acquaintance; nay, even more

candid and accommodating than we could have anticipated. He did every thing in his power to facilitate our free access, not only to the ears of his immediate charge, (and a more respectable and intelligent looking congregation I have not seen in my whole tour, than attends his weekly teachings,) but also to the citizens in general.

During my stay of eight days in the city, I delivered five lectures to large, attentive, and deeply interested congregations, as (Mr. Clapp being judge) usually or ever meet in that city. And such was the attention and the interest displayed on the whole occasion, that I doubt not that a large and flourishing congregation of Christians could be soon assembled even in New Orleans.

The talents, eloquence, and standing of Mr. Clapp are such as to insure, under the usual success of the gospel, when fairly and ably presented, a large church, if he could be induced (of which I am not without hope) to stand firmly and unequivocally on primitive ground. Oh! that he may become valiant for the truth, as he is to rebuke the follies and vices of the age! It would give me the greatest pleasure to learn that one of such generous and benevolent temperament had thoroughly espoused the cause of Christ's gospel, and had placed himself amongst the advocates of the one Lord, the one faith, the one baptism, the one body, one spirit, one hope. Then it would be the Spirit of the Lord, and the sword of Gideon against the uncircumcised enemies of the living and true God.

From New Orleans we ascended the Mississippi to Bayou Sarah, where we were met by Gen. Dawson, and conducted to his paradisaic residence in the vicinity of St. Francisville. He literally resides in the midst of gardens, which seem as though there were no winter in their year. Innumerable evergreens, with which the ever-verdant forests of Louisiana abound, as well as those of foreign extraction, in the richest luxuriance, and in the best taste as respects attitude, position, and general arrangement, mingled with flowers that bloom in January, give to his residence, even in winter, an Elysian appearance, and make one feel as though he were suddenly translated to Arabia Felix, to the environs of Eden, or to some of the spicy isles whose perennial bloom and fragrance form earth's richest types of a Paradise that is celestial and eternal. But that which gives the greatest beauty to this delightful spot, and sheds the sweetest odor on all its perfumes, is the Christian gracefulness and moral excellence of his amiable and heavenly-minded consort, Mrs. Dawson.

After speaking once in the Episcopal church of St. Francisville, we were conducted to Jackson, the seat of one of the state colleges of Louisiana, and the residence of brother Shannon, its highly gifted and accomplished President, under whose kind and

hospitable roof we spent some ten days in the most agreeable manner. Here we became personally acquainted with the intelligent and amiable brother Ranaldson and his good lady, who, unfortunately, during my stay were confined for the most part by indisposition, but were convalescing; and also with the excellent brother D'Spain, who, besides co-operating with brother Ranaldson, in his most interesting female seminary at Jackson, spends a portion of his time in doing the work of an Evangelist. We publicly spoke eight times in Jackson, five times in the Presbyterian church, which was generously tendered us by its liberal-minded Pastor, and three times in the college chapel. Notwithstanding the continuous rain of nearly a week, we had a fair and full hearing at this important point. The church at Jackson, from a very small beginning, has been steadily growing under the labors of brother Shannon and those co-operating with him. It grew but little during our stay; still the indications are very favorable, and a little more persuasiveness on the part of the advocates of the truth (the argumentative part of the work being well nigh accomplished by President Shannon) seems to be all that is wanting on our part to make the truth in that vicinity triumphant.

During our sojourn in Jackson, accompanied by President Shannon and Gen. Dawson, we went over to Clinton and delivered a lecture. Detained by high waters, we had to renew our appointments at Consolation and Woodville; and accordingly set out on Monday, 12th February in brother Shannon's carriage, for the residence of Major Johnson, distant from Woodville six miles.

As we passed along through the beautiful forests of Louisiana in a clear bright day, while the numerous evergreens, especially the splendid magnolias, were casting their shadows upon the ground, as with us at the North in June, our minds in retrospective mood dwelt upon the incidents of our stay in Jackson. Nothing, however, in or about that beautiful village, seemed in the distance to appear so admirable as the Christian courage of some of its worthy citizens, who, in defiance of public opinion, while yet the cause of the true and original gospel was weak, despised, misunderstood, and grossly misrepresented, arose in the greatness of their strength to speak for the cause of the sacramental lost of God's elect, and to bear "the reproach of Christ," and become partakers of "the afflictions of the gospel."

Of these brother Shannon stands eminently conspicuous. Elected to the presidency of a state institution, rather too of desperate fortune at the time, and, as many of our Southern colleges are, requiring all his great talents and well-earned popularity to raise it from its languishing condition, at the imminent

risk of his standing and influence, to say nothing of the office itself, which was often in peril, in as far as the threats and efforts of sectarian hostility to divest him of it could avail; I say, at all these hazards and risks he put forth all his energies and commenced a church of some four or five persons, and through bad report (for there was little good report of the Lord's ways in that country at that time) he labored at his post, and, to the shame and confusion of his enemies, has greatly elevated the institution, increased the number of its students, built a respectable congregation on the ancient foundation, and silenced the batteries of opposition. We had the pleasure of seeing his amiable consort united to this little flock, and rejoicing with him as a joint heir of the grace of eternal life.

On the morning of the 12th we safely arrived at the mansion of Major Joseph Johnson, one of the oldest and most respectable of the citizens of Mississippi. The Major, one might imagine, ought now to sit down and write his book of Ecclesiastes.—Blessed with a long and prosperous life, a fine constitution, intellectual and physical, affluent circumstances, as many and as happy servants as might have satisfied the patriarch Abraham, one would think this world could add nothing to his enjoyments. Still the old gentleman has not written his book of Ecclesiastes: for the rail road from St. Francisville to Woodville is not yet completed, nor are the Banks of Mississippi managed in all respects according to his views and wishes; and worse than all, he has neither son nor daughter to inherit his name, his virtues, or his fortune. For these reasons he cannot yet say, "Vanity of vanities—all is vanity;"—and therefore on our arrival he was absent on the affairs of the rail road.

Sister Johnson, the most amiable and excellent of Christian matrons, we found at home; and, if one might judge from the marks on the margin of her Family Testament, with the telescope of faith in her hand she often looks along the narrow way that leadeth to the right hand of God, and to the life and joys that are eternal. I need no other introduction to the inner temple of the human heart, in man or woman, than the marginal marks and remarks which they are pleased to make in their daily and devotional readings of the books of God's inspiration. If "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh," out of the abundance of our thoughts and feelings, in our pious readings and communings with the Bible, the hand marketh. I soon found a rich vein of religious and moral sentiment, and kindred feelings, in the free communings in which there is more of the fellowship of heaven than in all the doctrinal discussions and ecclesiastic polemics of a thousand ages.

On walking out into one of the richest gardens, most happily

combining the useful and the beautiful, in which sister Johnson spends much of her time, I was as much delighted with the spirit of a single remark, as with all the beautiful shrubs, and plants, and flowers with which it abounds. It was rather in the form of an apology for the pains taken in cultivating flowers and shrubs, that are more beautiful than useful. "Some," said sister Johnson, "think that the time spent in the cultivation of these is rather misspent than improved; but if our heavenly Father was pleased to spend time in creating and adorning them, I think I honor him in the few hours I spend in cultivating them."

As we passed along a little farther—pointing to a monument standing in the midst of a bower, "There," said she, "sleeps one that I too much idolized—a sweet child, a beloved niece that I adopted as my daughter. Heaven kindly interposed and took her away from me, lest by my fondness I should have spoiled her. I feel the wound; still there is an enchantment around this spot peculiar to itself." At another time she informed me that she had selected the spot where she intended to be laid, in the same fragrant bower; and that often at morn and even, with her Testament in hand, she repaired to that spot, and endeavored to anticipate the day, when, in the silence of the grave, her mortal remains would wait the reanimating power of her Redeemer's voice.

The next day we twice addressed the citizens of Woodville, and went on to Consolation, leaving an appointment to revisit that beautiful village. We had a good hearing at Consolation; and promising a two days' meeting on the Saturday and Lord's day following, we returned to Major Johnson's, where we had an appointment for Wednesday evening. The Major had returned home, and a few friends and neighbors were invited, although the discourse was intended for the servants on the plantation, of which there was a respectable congregation. Some of them can read; and as every Christian mistress ought, sister Johnson is at great pains to read to those who cannot read the Book of God, and to instruct them in its meaning. The consequence is, some of them are intelligent and pious; while all of them manifest in their whole exterior the kind administration of a good master and mistress.

On the next day we addressed a very large and attentive audience of all religious parties, in the town of Woodville—many of whom appeared much interested in the matter. But there is no Christian congregation in that place; and the large and commodious meeting-house, raised principally by the liberality of Major Johnson, shows, in the innumerable indignities done to its windows, that neither Baptist nor Christian principles are much in favor with some spirits in Woodville. A good sign, truly! The world loves its own!!

At Consolation we had a pleasant meeting of two days. Some dozen persons were added to the congregation; amongst whom were two of my old acquaintances. Dr. Foster, of Mississippi, and Mrs. Hollingsworth, formerly of Danville, Ky.

We enjoyed the Christian hospitalities of sister Stewart while we labored in that vicinity, whose praise is amongst all the brethren in those parts. Distinguished though she be with a mind of superior strength and with a liberal share of the bounties of Providence, she is more admirable and amiable because of her devotion to the truth and her liberal devices to sustain it. The difference between those who only *profess*, and those who at heart *feel* a deep interest in the promotion of truth, is not of difficult perception to those of ordinary optics. It would only require a few such zealous, ardent, liberal, and devoted spirits as sisters Johnson and Stewart to make the Lord's cause run and be glorified, even in Mississippi.

Christian females to the South are generally greatly in advance of the brethren in all the Christian virtues. There is something in the order of society—in the manners, customs, climate, or soil of the South exceedingly unfriendly to masculine piety and excellence. Riches, pleasure, power, are the transcendant themes; and men are the principal actors in the grand drama of fortune-making. This, of course, fills the whole soul; but if a single corner of the heart is left for religion, it is to foster some opinion, speculation, or dream, which never creates one genuine longing for the immortality of the gospel. The pursuit of wealth in the state of Mississippi is, perhaps, more sincere, genuine, and triumphant, than in any country in the world. The genius enterprize, and acquisitiveness of the boldest portion of the Saxon race, improved in Old England, advanced in New England, perfected in Mississippi, are emulous of the highest niche in the temple of Mammon. These chivalrous spirits, should they deign to have wives, leave to them the things of eternity, while they secure to themselves the good things of earthly trade and commerce.

I do not say that the whole sex, without a single exception are gone after gold. There are a few exceptions. Besides those who plead the cause of reformation in the intervals of the more pressing calls of this life, I found in those regions now under my eye some remarkable exceptions. Of those who either were or are members of the church in Grand Gulf, on the very bank of the Mississippi, with whom I formed a short acquaintance, I could name a few spirits of the character of brethren Pat Sharkey, Stamps, and M'Elpine, who are deeply interested not only in their own enjoyment of the gospel, but in furthering the progress at home and abroad. Still of this class there is but

a little salt, scarcely enough to preserve the mass from corruption.

After a very painful adieu to those amiable and excellent sisters and brethren in the vicinities of Woodville and Consolation, we were brought forward on our journey to Natchez by sister Stewart and brother Pate, accompanied by brother D'Spain. On this journey we spent one evening with our good brother Kells, of Prospect Hill, Mi., and on the next day arrived in the city of Natchez.

Here we enjoyed the pleasure of a meeting with some of our old acquaintance—amongst whom were brother and sister Hewit, brethren Ryan and B. H. Payne, all formerly of Kentucky. With brother B. H. Payne and his amiable and pious lady, and also J. N. Payne, now of Louisiana, we had several pleasing interviews while in New Orleans. We were all, indeed, like pilgrims in a dry and thirsty land, where the waters of life flow not as they were wont in the times of our earlier acquaintance in Kentucky, from 1824 down to their migration into the alluvions of the Mississippi. Still we thanked the Lord that we found them as green as they were in a soil so sterile of heavenly graces, and under a sky so ardent and scorching as that which extends over these vales of the American Nile.

In Natchez we delivered four discourses in the Methodist meeting-house on the great principles of Christ's gospel. We had a favorable audience; but no church being there, we found no great inducement to continue our efforts in that city. We also visited Grand Gulf, Port Gibson, and Vicksburg, places of much congeniality of feeling and character. In none of these cities, save Grand Gulf, is there an altar erected to the Lord of the New Testament. In Port Gibson we delivered three discourses in the Methodist and Presbyterian meeting-houses, which were opened to us; and found there another intelligent, excellent, and devoted sister, the lady of Judge M'Dugal, who very courteously and hospitably entertained us. We scattered the seeds of righteousness and piety with a liberal hand in this most beautiful of southern villages, and also in the village of Grand Gulf, the residence for some years of gifted brother our W. E. Matthews, who has, notwithstanding his secular calling and pursuits, exerted a considerable influence in behalf of truth. We were, during our sojourn in Grand Gulf, much pleased and refreshed with the company of brother Matthews, whose hospitalities we enjoyed, and with other choice spirits in that little congregation. We were all of opinion, from the very large and attentive hearing which we had in those places, and the interest manifested, that much good might be done in these two villages, only 8 miles apart, provided only it were prosecuted diligently and faithfully in the

spirit of the gospel. A few such veterans as grand-father M'Elpine, now in his 92d year, sanguine and strong in the Lord, and valiant for the truth, might subdue many to the obedience of faith.

A. C.

SHORT SERMONS ON CHRISTIAN PRACTICE.

SERMONS ON PRAYER—*No. I.*

TEXT.—Continue instant in prayer. *Col.* iv. 2. Be anxious for nothing; but in every thing by prayer and supplication let your requests be made known to God. *Phil.* iv. 6. Be patient in affliction, continue instant in prayer. *Rom.* xii. 12. Is any man afflicted? Let him pray. *James.* Praying always, with all deprecation and supplication in the spirit. *Eph.* vi. 18. Pray without ceasing. In every thing give thanks. 1 *Thess.* v. 18, 19. I exhort first of all, that deprecations, supplications, intercessions, and thanksgivings be made for all men—for kings and for all in authority; for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved, and to come to an acknowledgment of the truth. 1 *Tim.* ii. 1. Ask, and you shall receive; seek, and you shall find; knock, and it shall be opened to you. *Matth.* vii. 7. The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous, and his ears are open to their supplication. 1 *Pet.* iii. 12. Pray for one another.—The inwrought prayer of the righteous man availeth much. *James* v. 17. If you fathers know how to give good things to your children that ask you, how much more will your heavenly Father give good things to them that ask him. *Matth.* vii. 10.———[Lord, increase our faith in these promises!!]

RELIGION, my Christian brethren, as the term indicates, began after the Fall. Holy men and angels did not need faith, repentance, prayer, altars, priests, victims, rites, or religious usages, to bring them back, or bind them fast to God. The word *religion*, indeed, imports a previous apostacy. The verb *religo*, with all its family, indicates a *binding again*, or *tying fast* that which was dissolved. The primitive man loved, wondered, and adored, as angels now do, without religion; but fallen man needs religion in order to his restoration to the love, and worship, and enjoyment of God. To know and enjoy God himself is the supreme bliss, as it is the highest style and dignity of man; and to this, religion is but the means: for as Jesus says, "Man was not made for the Sabbath, but the Sabbath for man." So we may say that man was not made for religion, but religion, or a remedial system, was made for fallen man.

That which is properly called *religion* is immutably the same thing, though variously dispensed. Thus we have had various dispensations of religion adapted to the different states of the human family in its progress onward to the present moment. New institutions have characterized these different dispensations. Still the remedial system is necessarily and essentially the same thing; and therefore religion, in all its elements, is, like its Author, "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." Thus prayer, like faith and repentance, belongs to no age of

dispensation; but has always been an institution of grace—a part of a remedial system; and is alike the privilege of all the miserable and distressed of human kind who acknowledge a Mediator. Hence, while they who want nothing need not pray, the right of petition is the inalienable, equal, and universal right of all the miserable and distressed under a just and merciful administration.

But in order to our being acceptably heard in our deprecations, supplications, intercessions, and thanksgivings, there are certain indispensable prerequisites; and the burthen of my present discourse shall be a definition of these prerequisites.

The first of these in order is a *Mediator*. God cannot listen to a rebel on his own merit or account. It would be beneath his dignity, not merely in his own esteem, but also in that of a universe of pure and exalted intelligences, to commune with, or listen to, the importunities of a guilty and polluted transgressor. Hence we say with Paul, "There is but one God, and one Mediator between God and men—the man Christ Jesus"—and with Peter we say, "There is none other name under heaven given amongst men by which we must be saved:" for Jesus himself said, "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh to the Father but by me."

In the second place, faith in God and in his son Jesus Christ is indispensable; for "without faith," says Paul, "it is impossible to please God: for he that comes to God must believe that he exists, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him." "Let him ask in faith," says James; and let not the man that is undecided, or, that "wavereth, think that he shall receive any thing from the Lord."

In the 3d place, repentance, or a full preparation of our hearts to seek the Lord, is a prerequisite, without which no man can be accepted of God. Thus spake Peter to Simon, "*Repent* of this thy wickedness, and pray to God." And said the Lord to Jeremiah, "You shall pray unto me, and I will hearken unto you; and you shall seek me and find me, when you shall search for me *with all your heart*." Jer. xxix.12,13. A thousand testimonies speak the same things.

In the fourth place, we must be led by the Spirit; for we know not what we should ask without its teachings. In other words, we must pray according to the suggestions of the Holy Spirit, or its promptings in us. For example, we cannot pray for worldly riches and honor in faith, in repentance, or in the Holy Spirit: not because we have no promise of these things, but because such requests are not compatible with repentance, nor with the teachings of the Holy Spirit. We may, indeed, pray for competence, for influence, for wisdom, for the salvation of our families, &c. because such desires are prompted by the Holy Spirit.

Four things are therefore indispensable to acceptable and successful prayer—a Mediator, faith, repentance, and the teachings of the Holy Spirit. Without these four, no person can expect to be answered or accepted of the Lord. *And no man can ask any thing from the Lord, with these prerequisites, which he will not certainly obtain from the Lord.*

In these matters, other things not mentioned, may, by some, be supposed to be included. But, in the mean time, we teach only what

is now, and always was, indispensable to acceptable and successful prayer.

We shall now advert to two difficulties which have frequently fallen in our way:—

1st. No testimony, no promise—there can be no faith. Now as we have not promises importing to us that all things we may ask shall be conferred, how can we pray in faith? But it has been said that we must pray according to the Holy Spirit; consequently there is nothing which the Holy Spirit prompts us to ask which may not be asked in faith, that God is both able and willing to bestow it. Now the Holy Spirit has taught us that God wills our sanctification and salvation through the truth as it is in Jesus: consequently we may ask in faith whatever is necessary to this end. And whatever earthly bounties or temporal favors for ourselves or others we may ask, the Spirit teaches us to ask them confidently, so far as they may be according to the will of God; and no farther can we lawfully desire them. Our text affords ample proof of this: for Christians, as such, are commanded to "be anxious for nothing; but in every thing by prayer and supplication to make their requests known to God." Now I ask, would the Lord command so to ask without an intimation in the command that we should receive! If we are to "continue instant in prayer"—"to pray always"—"to pray without ceasing," and for all things that we can lawfully desire, surely it is because "the Lord's ears are open to our prayers," and it is that we may receive the blessings that we ask. If our natural and selfish parents answer our requests, how much more will our heavenly Father confer our desires!

But a second difficulty is sometimes urged with much vehemence—"Is not God immutable, and are not all his laws fixed? And does not prayer imply a wish to change the heavenly Father, or to cause him to change the laws of his moral or physical government?" I answer this difficulty by stating a fact, and adding an illustration of it: In the first place God has promised many favors on condition that they shall be asked. Now in obtaining those favors by prayer, we have only complied with the conditions on which God always and immutably willed to confer them. Now this may be illustrated many ways—as, for example, when Joseph, the governor of Egypt, had stowed away provisions for seven years' famine, he made proclamation to all Egypt, that, on certain conditions, he would supply every applicant with bread. Now when those applicants came and asked for bread according to the terms of the proclamation, could any one of them think that he had effected a change in the mind of the governor by his application! And should a sceptic in the power, wisdom, and generosity of Joseph, have asked an applicant while on his way to the store-houses, if he intended to effect a change in the mind of the governor; might he not have replied, No, sir, I am only complying with the gracious terms of his proclamation; for it is written in the proclamation, "For all these favors I will be inquired of by all the wretched sons of want in all the land of Egypt."

I have recently learned that there is much scepticism on the subject of the utility of prayer in the minds of some professors. I intend, with the help of the Bible and common sense, to attempt the eradication of this deleterious influence: for a prayerless Christian is as paradoxical to me as a lungless man. I could as easily believe that a man could

live seven years without breathing, as a Christian live seven days without praying. A. C.

REV. JOSEPH C. STILES—AGAIN.

A FEW days ago, while ascending the Mississippi river, I read, for the first time, a pamphlet, full of the grossest slanders and abuse, issued by the *Rev.* Parson above named; but falsely labelled on the cover, "Stiles' Reply to Alexander Campbell, No. 2." Printed at Frankfort, Ky., 1838: containing 56 pages 8mo. The article to which this pretends to be a reply, will be found in vol. 2, new series, page 276, M. H.

This is a second unsuccessful effort to cover his retreat, or to apologize for his cowardice in Versailles, October 16th, 1837. So far as there appears any excuse for himself in the whole performance, it is resolvable into an abortive attempt to show that I ought to have challenged him to a debate on all my writings on spiritual influence, on the ground of something said by some of our brethren, either in their conversations or public discussions touching these writings. All this, too, is assumed without any shadow of proof from any expression of mine, or from any covenant or stipulation on the part of my friends.

From these premises the chivalrous Parson affirms my fears in avoiding an issue with one of such tremendous power as himself; and yet, with all his swaggering and gasconading airs, he would not meet any of our public men in Kentucky, unless they would allow him half the day and all the night to prepare an answer to a single speech.—Thus he compelled brother Johnson, as I am informed, to speak in the after part of the day in reply to his morning speech, to which Mr. Stiles would not presume to reply till he had spent the evening and the morning in preparing for it! Yet he was always asking for some experienced debater to contend with him!! The truth is, Mr. Stiles dares not meet any of our public brethren in fair discussion on any Bible question. I do not speak of our most learned and practised proclaimers of the truth, but of our good common sense brethren—such as John Smith, of Montgomery, Ky. But his policy of gasconade is to call for some person afar off, that he has reason to believe will not come, and thus to save himself from exposure.

With all his recklessness and temerity, true, indeed, he does not deny that I invited—nay, pressed him to stand up to his allegations against our views: that I once—nay, repeatedly besought him to sustain his charges against my writings or preachings, emphatically

affirming that I stood prepared to show *that he could not redeem a single pledge he had given, or sustain a single point he had made against our teachings.* Nor does he, with all his temerity, dare to deny, that, after matters were thus, time after time, laid before him, he most decorously and gloriously, in the presence of a thousand persons, "backed out" of all his pledges, and retreated from every inch of ground he had assumed, to the mortification and even astonishment of all his friends on the ground. But worse and worse for his moral reputation, he is now deliberately endeavoring to shuffle and quibble himself out of this disgraceful and mortifying attitude by a preposterous attempt to show that I ought, according to some code of duelling honor, challenge him to mortal combat to some indefinite debate upon the speculative and scholastic generalities of mystic theology!!

The present sublime pamphlet—this spiritual second fruit of his pen, is, indeed, a triumphant vindication of my not challenging him to such a discussion—not, indeed, in the clearness or cogency of its arguments, but in the vulgarity of its abuse—the lowness, scurrility, and effrontery of its style, and in all its malevolent breathings towards brother John T. Johnson and myself. I should, indeed, have been reputably and profitably engaged in a grave discussion with the author of such a pamphlet on *spiritual influence*, on any Christian doctrine, who has satisfied the most incredulous that he is more conversant with the language of the Fish-market and the rhetoric of Grub street, than with the sacred style of the pure and holy spirit of the gospel.

The most charitable construction that I can put upon this pamphlet is, that the author of it has so long brooded over the spectres of his own imagination, he is really become insane on the whole premises which it covers. No other supposition can save him from the reputation of a most malicious slanderer—an inventor of falsehoods and hypocritical knave. In his opening prayer at Versailles, in the presence of an immense congregation, he prayed for himself as the servant of the Lord, and then for me as another *servant* of the Lord; that as *servants* of the Lord we might enter on the business of the day, &c.—and in his first letter giving an account of this interview, he says to me, "Sir, remember it was just there, in your own church, with the pride and flower of the Reformation around you, that I solemnly proclaimed you, in my estimation, a *pompous impostor!*" To God he said I was his servant; to man he said I was a pompous impostor!! Did he insult Heaven with a lie, and honor man with the truth! Alas for the honor of the "sacred desk," when such persons stand in it! But in his second letter the *reverend* Pastor says he did not proclaim me a "pompous impostor," because he had not marked it with inverted commas;

but only meant he proclaimed it in substance—that is essentially and substantially, but not verbally, formally, audibly, sensibly, perceptibly! Then, on his logic, and grammar, and honesty, I might say that I then and there proclaimed Joseph C. Stiles to be a barefaced hypocritical pretender!

But this is not the only proof that this *reverend debater* has no memory, no sanity, or that he has no regard for truth. In his Letter II. page 14, concerning his fellow-*servant* in the Lord he positively uses the following words: "Sir, I have heard it a thousand and ten thousand times, that you are a man marked above your fellows for a shameful destitution of moral principle." If exclamations were lawful, I should certainly have filled a line with them at this period. But as it is, I leave it blank.

This is no hyperbole; for it is "ten thousand and one thousand," or *eleven thousand times*. And yet in the presence of a multitude, many of whom will confirm it by an oath, if necessary, he acknowledged me to God as his servant!! But it was since that time he heard eleven thousand persons say as above—from my June letter probably till the month of September, in some sixty or ninety days; that is, he heard it 120 times every day for ninety days; or give him a whole year from the prayer to the publication of his second letter, and make it only a little more than thirty times a-day! And yet he says his memory is so leaky these times that he could not tell the Commissioner of his county whether he had 27 or 28 slaves. But he intimates his memory only fails about earthly things: in spiritual matters, such as falsehoods, slanders, and detractions, it is accurate to a fraction!

He must be a voluntary sceptic in the words of Joseph C. Stiles, that from this time forth can believe that he has any conscientious regard for either truth or honor. He cannot produce any respectable man in Kentucky that will make such a declaration. He cannot adduce a single witness in support of his infamous calumny. It is the mere ebullition of a superlatively wicked heart, or of an insane head. No gentleman, no Christian could be guilty of such an outrage; and, therefore, nothing that such a man can hereafter say about religion, or religious men, can command from me the least notice.

The only excuse I have for this unhappy and conceited man, is, that he is not *compos mentis* on this subject; and having understood in my recent tour in the vicinities of his nativity, that insanity is to some extent a family complaint, I attribute it rather to this, than to such a destitution of moral principle as could fabricate so many falsehoods as I find on these pages. True, Dr. Hall, I am told, informed him in the presence of several witnesses, that he would prove him guilty of false-

hood whenever he called upon him. But Mr. Stiles has had the prudence not to call upon him for proof.

Before I heard of any family weakness of this sort (as many of my friends who heard me say it can testify) I alleged immediately after the Versailles interview, that, when Mr. Stiles was a little excited, I clearly saw the lines of insanity in the whole contour of his expression; and that I could hardly regard him as a responsible agent under any high excitement. For this very reason, and from pure sympathy for a poor fallen fellow-creature, at the time when he publicly declined any debate on the grounds of his charges against me or my principles; when I put the question to him in the most formal manner whether he would make an effort to sustain his allegations; and when he unequivocally declined in the presence of a multitude, a gentleman standing by said to me, "Repeat that again, that all may hear and understand it," I said, No: my sympathy for my fallen antagonist was such, that I could not possibly farther expose him; and the most cordial shake of his hand immediately after, assured me that he then felt a glow of gratitude to me for the generosity I had shown him. But I will not now relate the cause that I heard assigned for the effort he has since made to wipe off his reproach. * * * *

On any view of Joseph Stiles, I cannot regard him as worthy of the notice which our brethren in Kentucky have taken of him. I have now a pamphlet in manuscript of facts, documents, comments, and vouchers, from Kentucky, touching his letter so far as these brethren, John T. Johnson, or myself, is concerned. It was sent here during my absence, for publication. It most clearly and amply sustains brother Johnson and all persons implicated in his libellous publications. But really I think the occasion demands not its publication. The tongue or the pen of Joseph Stiles can slander no man—much less such a man as John T. Johnson. It is raising a tempest to move a feather, or loading a cannon to kill a fly. Will the brethren allow me to delay the publication till they see a little more of this unhappy man?

His relatives in Georgia and his Presbyterian friends in Kentucky, I have heard from respectable sources, are deeply mortified about this pamphlet. He is, upon the whole, greatly aiding the cause of reformation in Kentucky by his violence. Witness some forty baptisms last Fall by our brethren, at the end, and on the very ground, of one of his series of sermons of abuse of our views and character. If the brethren in the vicinity of his operations will preach the gospel as they now do, and let Joseph Stiles rage, and foam, and fret against them, when and where he pleases, he will continue to be one of the most useful men in the state, and they will continue to see how the Lord can make the wrath of man to praise him, and restrain the remainder of it.

If it does not yet appear to this community that I am always willing and prepared to defend any tenet that I have publicly taught, when an honorable and competent opponent presents himself, whether Christian or Infidel, Protestant or Papist, nothing that I can now say could prove it. And that my custom has ever been to receive, not to give challenges—to meet opposition, not to provoke it—is, to those who have examined these matters, equally evident. If we cannot always find a Christian, we always look for a gentleman with whom to contend. There are many Presbyterian gentlemen of learning and talent, and of the Christian virtues, with whom it would be a pleasure for me to converse on Christian principles, or to discuss or debate any question of practical utility. My mouth and my pages are always open to each and every one of this class when they please to invite discussion. But to go round the country offering challenges, or accepting them from every novice, has always been supremely ridiculous in my eyes.

I have been for some time engaged in a written discussion with one greatly superior in learning and manners to Joseph Stiles, on the subject of Divine Influence. While I believe and teach a divine influence on sinners and saints, I deny that the regeneration of the schools is the Christian regeneration of the New Testament; and feel able and willing, in the case of his failure, to attempt, in any honorable case, to show that neither the Calvinian nor the Arminian work of the Spirit is the sanctifying and saving work of God's Spirit as taught in the Old and New Testaments.

But I am disgusted beyond expression with the style and manners of the religious controvertists of this age; and more especially with those who debate on spiritual influences. Most of them seem to be possessed of demons, rather than of the Spirit of God. The fruits of the Spirit in them are,—defamation, anger, wrath, evil speaking, calumnies, falsehood, vulgarity, hatred, variance, strife. The pamphlet of Joseph C. Stiles is a disgrace to the 19th century. It would have been a disgrace during the pontificate of Gregory VII., much more now in that of Gregory XVI. The Baptist Chronicle, in its days of defamation, has not been equalled in Kentucky, till the letters of Joseph C. Stiles. The assault and battery, the club and knife feats of Uriel B. C—— in his brutal attempts on the life of his brother Dudley, ought to be a warning to all the physical operationists in Kentucky. A. C.

UNION OF CHRISTIANS—*No. I.*

I AM glad to see that the cause of Christian union, so dear to the heart of every true Christian, is exciting an unusual attention in many

sections of the country. With me this has ever been a darling theme. My first essays, both as a preacher and writer, were much in this spirit, and directed to this end. But it was some time before we could clearly see the ground on which all true Christians could form one visible and harmonious union, and cordially co-operate in a common salvation. It is indeed profitable to think, to talk, to write on the subject of union; because we shall at least understand more clearly the evils of division, the causes of them, the cure of them, and the sovereign antidotes against them; and besides it will bring us to exchange a little more of the civilities and courtesies of the Christian profession, and perhaps tend a little to the cultivation of that Christian and catholic spirit that must precede the union of Christians.

Meantime, we shall still contribute our mite to this cause, and occasionally submit a reflection or a project to those who make this exclusively the object and end of their labors. And as in the meantime we have only room for a single suggestion on the subject, we shall only preface it by an important fact, viz.—the union of sects would not be the union of Chistians; neither, perhaps, would the union of Christians be a union of sects. However, an effort to unite the sects might tend very directly and powerfully to unite the Christians. I will, therefore, on this hypothesis propose,—1st. That a congress of all Protestant parties (and if any one choose to add the Greek and Roman sects, I will vote for it) be convened in some central place, and that this congress be composed of delegates appointed by all parties in the ratio of their entire population.

In the second place, when convened according to appointment, *the rule of union* shall be, that, whatever in *faith*, in *piety*, and *morality* is catholic, or universally admitted by all parties, shall be adopted as the basis of union; and whatever is not by all parties admitted as of divine authority, shall be rejected as schismatical and human.

In the third place, all the parties shall, by their delegates, solemnly pledge themselves to submit to all things that are purely catholic, or universally accredited by all parties; and to abandon whatever tenets, forms, or usages they may have which are not admitted as of divine authority by all Christendom.

I, for one, will vote for this. Will any one second it? And let him that is of contrary opinion give ONE GOOD REASON against it. We do not ask for two, as we have room only for one at a time. I have many other projects to offer; but one at a time is enough. I therefore very respectfully offer it for examination and discussion to all lovers of Christian union throughout the land.

A. C.

CHRISTIANS AMONG THE SECTS—*No. IV.*

CHRISTIANOS had hoped to be permitted to give his views upon positive ordinances unmolested: he had supposed that the feverish excitement occasioned by brother Campbell's answer to the "Lunenburg sister" some two years ago, had been wholly allayed. But "vain are the hopes of man." Christianos had scarcely commenced his course, until he found himself assailed. If he were disposed for *war*, he too would unsheath his sword; and, placing himself against "the everlasting hills," would exclaim in the language of the Highland Chieftain King—

"Come one! come all! These rocks shall fly
From their firm base, as soon as I"

But Christianos has no mind for controversy. He well knows that the moment a man assumes the attitude of a controversialist, he disqualifies himself for giving a candid examination to the reasoning of his opponent. Hence the most irresistible arguments produce no other effect upon the opposing party than to arouse every energy for self-defence: for as one has said, "In the heat of controversy men would not know *truth* if it met them full in the face." Perhaps I have taken too grave a view of the strictures of our beloved father Henley; for indeed he has approached Christianos not indeed with a *drawn sword*, but in a most condescending manner, with the request to be admitted in our travelling conveyance as "a fellow-passenger in quest of the same object." Christianos has no control over the *vehicle*, any farther than his individual seat is concerned; also, being no way churlish, he has no objection to have the coach well filled. One thing, however, by way of anticipating, Christianos is *exceedingly taciturn;* and if he should *appear* to be unsociable, he wishes to assure his fellow-travellers that it is not because he feels incommoded by their presence or their conversation; but because he is greatly given to abstraction. Christianos would make one request of his "companions in travel," viz. that they will not break the train of his reflections by talking too loud. He will take some notes by the way, and give them to the public, with some general remarks upon the whole tour, when we shall have reached our goal.

The hints so kindly given by our father Henley to guide us in our inquiries as to the 'when, where, and to whom spoken,' I shall as kindly receive, and not the less so because unnecessary. I had long ago discovered that the neglect of *this* was the source of endless confusion and mistake.

I shall be careful to quote with reference to the connexion, and also to quote truly. But one of my quotations is already challenged. To be sure I did not quote the common version of John vii. 17.; but Dr. George Campbell's version, "If any man is *minded to do his will*," &c. is sustained by all the authorities in our land. I have now lying before me three standard Greek Lexicons, which all concur in the following definition of *thelo*, the root of the word in question: "To will, wish, desire, to choose, prefer, take pleasure or delight in." Dr. Campbell's translation of this sentence is more perspicuous than the common version, but is by no means elegant. It would be better rendered, 'If any

man is disposed to do his will,' &c. or, 'If any man desires,' &c. But let this pass.

I can but notice the use that is made of the concessions of a Methodist. He admits that there are Methodists who are not Christians, and Christians who are not Methodists. But do you hence infer that there are no Christians among the Methodists? If this be not the point of father Henley's "demonstration," I do not understand him: for he asks "Why, then, should any man contend for Christians among the sects"?

We will look at this. Let me ask father Henley, Are all the citizens of these United States genuine republicans? He will answer, No. Well, are there not republicans in countries not belonging to this Union? He will answer, Yes. But will a by-stander exclaim, 'Ergo, there are no republicans in this Union'? The admission would prove, what is obviously true, viz.—that our institutions are not *purely*, and *wholly*, and *exclusively* republican. The admission of the Methodist proves no more concerning their system. If Christianos were a passionate man, he would *spurn with ineffable contempt* that narrow-minded bigotry which would shut the gates of mercy against every one but "my party." The pure benevolence, the diffusive charity of the gospel bursts such narrow confines—it overleaps such petty boundaries. "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold," said our Divine Lord to the proud Jews, who thought themselves the only objects of Divine complacency. How extended and sublime that benevolence which proclaims in the language of the Prophet Malachi, "For, from the rising of the sun unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in *every place* incense shall be offered unto my name, and a *pure offering:* for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of hosts." How did our Lord rebuke the narrow-mindedness of his beloved Apostle John, who said to him, "Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and we forbade him because he followeth not with us. And Jesus said unto him, Forbid him not; for he that is not against us is on our part."

In the strictures before me there is a grave charge brought against the views I have set forth from the scriptures. Father Henley says in his second essay, "This *mental religion*, that 'is minded to,' but *does not do*, has filled the world with a multitude of disobedient, prayerless, Christless professors." I deny, in the most unqualified terms, that the views set forth by Christianos ever made *one such character:* but I could easily fill a folio volume with proof that the opposite views have made *millions of millions* of such characters!! I appeal to the annals of the world, sacred and profane, civil and ecclesiastical, Jewish and Christian, to say if it has not been trusting in the *externals of religion* that has wrought, in all ages, ruin and desolation!!

This could never have been, but for an entire mistake as to the nature of positive ordinances in general. I here assert (what I presume will not be disputed by any one; but if it should, I will fully prove it in due time,) that *no action* performed by man can have any necessary and inherent character or properties. The best actions may be done from the vilest motives; and the worst actions may be done, and no guilt incurred. Ignorance of this has led people on the one hand to place all their hopes of salvation in outward forms; and on the other hand, to reject outward forms altogether. The *memorials* of a Saviour's body

and blood are *adored* as a Divinity, and *rejected* as senseless things. If the externals of religion were set forth in their true light, we should have no Quakers in the world. It was the perversion of these institutions that originated that sect. Those who have sought to make these institutions imposing, have clothed them in mystery. Even our own brethren, who have made themselves proverbial by insisting so much on the rational simplicity of the Christian system, have fallen into this error. A late writer in the "Christian Preacher," in a discourse on this subject, says, "They" (that is, positive ordinances) "have always been the most unlikely means for attaining the proposed end." I am not certain that I have precisely his words, as I quote from memory; but I know I have the idea. I am surprised that a writer of so much intelligence should have suffered so unguarded an expression to pass from him to the public. Was it not when speaking to the Jews upon positive ordinances, that Jehovah said, "Come, let us *reason* together"? Indeed, if there is a subject in the whole Book which can be shown to the understanding of a child, it is that positive ordinances are founded in the fitness of things. They are any thing but the arbitrary, unreasonable things they are usually set forth to be; as I hope to show before I dismiss the subject. But while I am showing this, I shall also show that they are *means*, and not *ends;* that they are to be valued only for their moral and devotional tendencies. They are perfectly adapted to us in our weak and fallen condition. In these institutions "our sense assists our faith." The mistake with multitudes is, that we are serving God in attending to these institutions. We are rather serving ourselves. They are given "for our sakes." "The Sabbath was made for *man*, and not man for the *Sabbath*," is of universal application to these institutions. Indeed, I am of opinion that the word "obedience" is no where used in the Book to signify submission to positive institutions exclusively. On the other hand, they are often contradistinguished from each other: "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in *obeying* the voice of the Lord? Behold, to *obey* is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams," was the address of the Prophet to Israel's rebellious king. "If ye be willing and *obedient*, ye shall eat the good of the land," said the Most High to apostate Israel; when, at the same time they were so zealous in the observance of positive institutions that they were *stall-feeding* the victims for the altar, because they thought beasts from the field, as Moses commanded, were not a sufficient *commutation* for their offences. And under the same circumstances the Lord, by the Prophet Jeremiah, says to them, "For I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them, in the day that I brought you out of the land of Egypt concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices; but *this thing* commanded I them, saying, *Obey my voice*, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people; and walk ye in all the ways that I have commanded you, that it may be well with you."

These scriptures show demonstrably that submission to positive ordinances, unless it tend to *moral purity and devotion of heart*, is not regarded by the Lord of hosts as *obedience at all*. The state of the *heart*, or the *affections*, is the "*all in all*" in the sight of our Creator. Neither the Jewish Sabbath, nor the whole burnt offerings—the sacrifice and incense of the law, nor the institutions of the gospel baptism,

the Lord's supper, the Lord's day, and prayer, have any value in themselves considered. There are two considerations which impart value to positive institutions:—1st. If duly understood and attended, they indicate that state of *mind* which makes us acceptable to the Lord; and are, *to us*, a ground of assurance, that we could not otherwise have, that we possess that state of mind. 2d. When duly understood, they produce moral and devotional effects upon the heart and life, which nothing else could do. But the same mistake is made by thousands on this subject as to spiritual life and enjoyment, that Socrates affirms is made with regard to animal life and enjoyment. He says, "We ought to *eat* that we may *live;* and not *live*, as many do, for the sake of *eating and drinking*." But of this again.

CHRISTIANOS.

THE DIRECT AND IMMEDIATE INTENTION OF THE CHRISTIAN INSTITUTION.

ESSAY III.

In the close of our second essay upon this all-important subject we have considered it as manifestly proved, "that the constraining influence of the love of God the Father, and of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, as exhibited in the divine testimony, is the very principle of that holiness without which none can please and enjoy the Lord; nor live entirely devoted to him."

We now proceed to show that this genuine holiness, this entire self-devotion, is not only the native and necessary offspring of the love of God, as expressly commanded: (see Luke x. 27. "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind:") but that it is also most expressly and unequivocally enjoined; and that both negatively and positively: see Luke xiv. 26, 27, 33; Rom. xiv. 7, 8; 1 Cor. x. 31; 2 Cor. xi. 2; Col. iii. 17. "If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters; yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. And whoever does not bear his cross, and come *after* me, cannot be my disciple."—"Whoever he be of you, that forsakes not *all* that he has, cannot be my disciple."—"None of us lives to himself, and no [Christian] man dies to himself. For whether we live, we live to the Lord; and whether we die, we die to the Lord; whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's."—"Whether, therefore, you eat or drink, or whatever you do, do all to the glory of God."—"I am jealous over you with a godly jealousy; for I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you a chaste virgin to Christ."—"Whatever you do in word or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God and the Father by him." Now what demands and injunctions can be more comprehensive—more decisively exclusive in their requirements of an entire devotedness, than these contained in the above citations?

Moreover, it is also evident that this entire self-devotion naturally and necessarily flows from the New Covenant relation in which we

stand to God as our Father—to Christ as our Redeemer, our Lord and Saviour—and to the Holy Spirit as the immediate Author of our spiritual life; and of our salvation from under the deadly influence and dominion of sin. We shall, therefore, proceed to advert to these things briefly and particularly.

1. And first, with respect to our New Covenant relation to God as our Father, it is written, Matth. vi. 9. "When you pray, say, Our Father who art in heaven." Now this is the first time that the professing people are divinely and explicitly taught thus to address God. And be it observed, that it is by his only begotten Son, addressing his professed disciples, the acknowledged children of the New Covenant: Jer. xxxi. 34. "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: —I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people:—For they all shall know me from the least of them to the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." Wherefore it is to such only that it is divinely commanded so to pray; and therefore it is exclusively their privilege so to do; for as such they are exclusively begotten of God. John i. 12, 13; James i. 18; 1 John v. 1; Rom. xii. 13. "To as many as received him, he gave power to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."—"Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we might be a kind of first fruits of his creatures."—"Whoever believes that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God."—"No man can call Jesus *Lord* but by the Holy Spirit." Such are, therefore, exhorted to be followers—imitators of God, as "dear children;" and to "walk in love as Christ also loved them." And the Apostle to the Romans exhorts such for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the Spirit, to co-operate with him for certain important purposes; thereby plainly alleging the paramount influence of these divine motives. And, indeed, what truly dutiful son is there, that is not supremely devoted to the will of his father while he abides in the family? Our Lord, who is the divinely appointed pattern of his people in this, as in all his other imitable perfections, gives us to understand, that it was his very meat and drink to do the will of his heavenly Father. It was his primary purpose—the sole, actuating, formative principle of his whole life, in this world, so to do. Moreover, though he was the only begotten of the Father, yet was he also his most devoted servant. Isai. xlii.; Luke xxii. 42; John xviii. 11; Phil. ii. 7; Heb. v. 8, 9. "Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delights."—"Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me: nevertheless, not *my will*, but *thine* be done."—"The cup that my Father has given me, shall I not drink it?"—"Being in the form of God—he made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant—he humbled himself, and became obedient to death, even the death of the cross."—"Though he was a son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered: and being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him." And what is his final, his comprehensive consummative command, to all that would partake with him in the enjoyment of his salvation? Is it not, "If any one wil

come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me?" Matth. xvi. 24. And again, John xii. 26. "If any will serve me, let him follow me; and where I am, there shall also my servant be: if any man serve me, him will my Father honor."—"If we suffer with him, we shall also reign with him." 2 Tim. ii. The Captain of our salvation was made perfect through sufferings. Heb. ii. 10.

2. Hence our New Covenant relations to the Father, and to the Son, lay us under infinite and insuperable obligations to *be*, and to *feel*, intensely and entirely devoted to the love and obedience of both:—of the Father, for giving his son, his only begotten son, to suffer and die for our sins:—of the Son, for his voluntary submission to inconceivable and tremendous sufferings for our salvation. Nor is there any embarrassing difficulty in adjusting those distinct claims of supreme and infinite obligation; for the economical and essential unity of the divine claimants completely obviate this: for he who loves, honors, and obeys the Son, in so doing honors and obeys the Father who sent him: whose final and consummative command to his children is, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; *hear ye him*." Matth. xvii. 5. "For the Father judges no man, but has committed all judgment to the Son: that all should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father." John v. 22, 23.

3. Nor is our devotion and submission to the Holy Spirit, in his official dictations by the holy Apostles and Prophets, (who all spoke as they were moved by him,) less imperative and obligatory; or less consistent with our supreme love and absolute devotion to the Father, and to the Son, for he proceeds from both; being the authoritative messenger, and efficient agent of both;—our divine Regenerator, Tutor, and immediate Advocate; so that whoever rejects or blasphemes him in the execution of his new covenant office, rejects both the Father and the Son; and, of course—the enjoyment of the great salvation which they have provided. See John iii. 5; and xiv. 16; and xv. 26; and xvi. 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 15; Acts v. 32; Rom. viii. 9, 14, 16, 17, 26, 27; Gal. iv. 6; Eph. iv. 30; 1 Thess. v. 19; Heb. vi. 4; Isai. lxiii. 10. "Except a man be born of water and Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."—"I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the Spirit of truth."—"When the Comforter is come, whom I will send to you from the Father—the Spirit of truth which proceeds from the Father, he shall testify of me."—"I tell you the truth, it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come to you; but if I depart, I will send him to you; and when he is come, he will convince the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment. When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all the truth; for he shall not speak of himself; but whatever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will show you things to come. He shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it to you. All things that the Father has are mine."—"And we are his witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Spirit, which God has given to them that obey him."—"Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his."—"For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.—The Spirit itself bears witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint

heirs with Christ."—"Likewise the Spirit also helps our infirmities: for we know not what to pray for as we ought; but the Spirit itself makes intercession for us with inarticulate groanings. And he that searches the hearts, knows what is the mind of the Spirit, because he makes intercession for the saints according to the will of God."—"And, because you are sons, God has sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father."—"Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby you are sealed to the day of redemption."—"Quench not the Spirit."—"For it it impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, if they shall fall away, to renew them again to repentance."—"They rebelled, and vexed his Holy Spirit; therefore he was turned to be their enemy, and he fought against them."—"All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven to men: but the blasphemy against the Holy Spirit shall not be forgiven to men."—"Whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in that which is to come."

Now realizing the whole of these premises, this new covenant revelation of the Divinity (as every intelligent Christian must necessary do) can any thing short of supreme love to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and entire self-devotion to the divine will, possess the mind of such a believer? Or, can a person, indeed, be a Christian at all, without this supreme love and devotion? Most certainly not: for without this state of mind he is not saved from his sins.—He loves something more than he does his heavenly Father, his gracious Saviour, his divine Regenerator and Sanctifier. There is something else he loves better—some others he would rather please. And can *such a person* be a Christian? The term *Christian*, is here taken in its proper scriptural sense—that is, "*a new creature:*" "for if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature."

4. Again—Does not our Lord in the close of his sermon on the mount, Matth. vii. 26., expressly declare, That every one who hears his sayings, and does them not, shall be likened to a foolish man, who built his house upon the sand:—That when the rains descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, it fell, and great was the fall of it? Now does not this show the indispensable necessity of being governed by his sayings—of reducing them all to practice, if we would enjoy his salvation? And what does he say in said discourse respecting the attributes of character that constitute the approved subjects of his kingdom? See Matthew, 5th chapter, from the 3d to the 17th verse. And what from the 21st verse to the end of said chapter—against gratuitous anger—reproachful language—living in a state of irreconciliation with an offended brother;—against cherishing impure desires—unlawfully divorcing a wife;—using profane language—retaliation and revenge? And what—his injunctions to liberality in giving and lending—to love our enemies—to pray for them that hate, despitefully use, and persecute us; that so we may be conformed to the example and will of our heavenly Father? And what in the 6th chapter—against religious ostentation in almsgiving, fasting, and prayer? And also against laying up treasures on earth—against an evil eye, or indulging in inconsistent views, attempting to serve two masters—God and Mammon? Also, against all manner of anxiety about the necessaries of life—and the preferring of any thing before the possession and enjoyment of the kingdom of God and his righteousness? And, in the 7th chapter—against presumptuous and rash judgment;—censuring and correcting a brother, while neglecting to correct and reform ourselves?—And what his gracious encouragements to importunity and perseverance in prayer:—to do to *all*, as we would have

them do to *us*:—to enter in at the *strait* gate, and to walk in the narrow way of self-denying obedience, as the only way to heaven, out of which no one *can be* his disciple? Yea, does he not expressly declare, that none can, or ever will, be acknowledged as his genuine followers, his true disciples, but only such as bring forth the good fruits of impartial universal obedience to all his precepts? See from the 21st verse to the end of the chapter.

But to follow this out, by a complete induction of all the particulars, enjoined and forbidden, would lead us to the investigation of every page to the end of the Book. This, however, is not our intention; and would be as impracticable to our present limits, as it is unnecessary to our present purpose; which, in the mean time, is only to show the absolute and indispensable necessity of universal self-denying obedience, in order to the constitution of Christian character; and which, indeed, is but another name for personal holiness, or entire devotion to God. Now for this purpose we think the scriptures above quoted are amply sufficient, though they fall far short of an express detail of the full amount of the Christian obedience which they comprehensively and virtually inculcate: the close and studious investigation of the whole Bible will be necessary to this.

Upon the whole, let it be duly observed and understood, that this intense and entire devotion, thus divinely inculcated, does not consist in the sensible excitement of the passions, nor in the impassioned exercise of the affections, excited to ecstacies by artificial means, addressed either to the imagination, or to the senses: but is the grave, serious, and sober effect, of the due scriptural conviction and consideration of the great fundamental truths of the gospel; namely, the love of the Father, the grace of the Son, the remission of sins, the adoption of sons, the fellowship of the Spirit, the glorious resurrection, and the blissful immortality, which the blessed gospel presents to our faith and to our hope. For it is written, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whoever believes in him might not perish, but have eternal life.---You know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, though he was rich; being in the form of God, the brightness of his glory, the express image of his person, upholding all things by the word of his power; yet for our sakes he became poor, that we through his poverty might be rich: in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins;---that we might receive the adoption of sons:---and because you are sons, God has sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba---Father. When Christ our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory:---who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like to his glorious body.---We know, that when he shall appear, we shall be like him,—that we shall see him as he is.---And so we shall be ever with the Lord.--For he that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him, also freely give us all things."——Now let us hear what *is*, and *must be*, the genuine devotional effect of the knowledge and belief of these blissful and glorious promises. See 2 Cor. v. 9, 14. "We labor that we may be accepted of him. For the love of Christ *constrains* us, because we *thus judge* that if *one died* for *all*, then were *all* dead; and that he died for *all*, that they *who live* should not henceforth *live to themselves*, but to *him*, *who died and rose again for them*." Can any words be more expressive, or any sentiment more effective, of an entire self-devotion, than the above? Or is it possible that any thing else could be the effect of a real belief of the above premises?

THOMAS CAMPBELL.

SCEPTICISM.

LETTERS TO B——, A SCEPTIC—*No. IV.*

West Middleton, April 11th, 1839.

My dear Friend,

I proceed with your difficulties. The *abuses* and *absurdities* of the doctrine of mediation have occasioned more scepticism than the thing *itself*. The death of Christ is set forth by one party as a commercial transaction, in which an equivalent is paid for a certain number of the human race; and these are sure of salvation, whatever their characters may be. The only use of a good character, to this elect number, is as a present ground of assurance that they are of that number!! But another view of this subject, equally absurd, is the setting the death of Christ as a propitiatory sacrifice, to appease the wrath and stay the vengeance of an enraged Sovereign. To these absurdities I will devote a subsequent letter. But objections which originated in the perversion of the doctrine have been transferred to the thing itself; so it is now a common-place saying with Sceptics, "We can see no connexion between the sufferings of an innocent person and the guilt of a transgressor." I readily grant that this is a mystery—as, indeed, what is not? How little do we understand of all that is above us, below us, and around us! Yet this is a mystery with which we are exceedingly familiar. We live continually by mediation. Has a man unfortunately swallowed a deadly poison? a mediator is employed; a counter poison is interposed. Now I can see no connexion between the poison and the cure; yet I have sufficient evidence to assure me that such connexion actually exists. Again, we are sick: we call for a mediator; the restoratives of the healing art are interposed: but I cannot understand the connexion between the medicine and the disease; yet I know it exists. Again, we are hungry; and this hunger would soon destroy our lives: we require mediation; food is interposed, and its ravages are stayed, and its power broken; yet I cannot, by any means, see the connexion that exists between the hunger that I feel and the food that I eat. I am, however, perfectly satisfied that a connexion does somehow exist.

But it is farther objected that the *death* of this Mediator should be required in order that his mediation should be available to us. I will not say that I understand this either; yet I can say that *every thing* in nature, as respects us, is perfectly analogous! We are sheltered—we are clothed—we are fed with the spoils of death. Beasts have for their shelter the pendant-branches and the luxuriant foliage of the livin forest; for their couches they have earth's verdant carpet; and for their clothing they have a living mantle of wool, of fur, or glossy hair. But as for man, whether it respects his habitation, his couch, his food, or his clothing, he lives by death. I repeat it with emphasis, *we live by death:* yet a man may say, I can see no connexion between animal and vegetable *death* and human life. But sure are we that we can enjoy *life in no other way*. To conclude this point, it is as easy to conceive of *moral poison* as *natural;* it is as easy to conceive of *mental* as *bodily* disease; it is as easy to perceive the necessity of a *physician* in the

one case as the other; it is as easy to see the necessity of mediation for the wants and sufferings of the *mind* as the *body;* it is as easy to conceive of enjoying spiritual *life* by *death*, as natural life by death. If you will explain these things in nature to my understanding, I will engage to explain the same things in revelation to yours.

With much affection and benevolence, I am your friend,

M. S. CLAPP.

THE GOSPEL—*No. III.*

"Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the GOSPEL which I preached unto you, which also you have received, and wherein ye stand: by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, *how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures.*" 1 COR. XV. 1—4.

IT is related of the followers of the celebrated *Wickliffe*, that the Papists used to call them, in derision, *Gospellers*, because they were wont to speak so often of the original gospel, in place of the legends and traditions of the Catholic superstition. It were well if modern reformers would so signalize themselves by their devotion to the gospel in its simplicity as to deserve so good an appellation.

In entering upon the consideration of this most important subject, our attention is naturally first engaged with the terms and phrases employed by the sacred writers to designate it. The precise meaning of these terms and phrases may be certainly and easily ascertained from the divine record by means of the definitions furnished by the inspired writers. And if in any case definitions be not furnished to our hand, we can form them, with the greatest accuracy, by a careful induction of the various passages in which these words and phrases occur. This last is the course which we naturally pursue when in reading an author we meet with a word or expression new to us. We have at first only a vague impression of the author's meaning, and we are obliged, for the time being, to substitute our conjecture in order to make the passage at all intelligible. The next sentence in which the word occurs in a different connexion renders their conjecture a little more definite and correct: a third example of its use narrows still more the field of doubt; till at length a

more extensive induction supplies us with the fixed and accurate definition.*

It is customary in every language to have a number of different words and phrases to express the same idea. These synonyms we find very often in the New Testament, and not a few of them are used in reference to the topic before us. Upon examination it will be seen that no less than sixteen are employed to designate it. These are the following:—The word; The word of God; The word of the kingdom; The gospel; The gospel of the kingdom; The word of the Lord; The word of salvation; The word of grace; The word of the gospel; The word of reconciliation; The word of truth; The gospel of salvation; The word of life; The word of the truth of the gospel; The word of faith; The testimony of God.† It is only necessary to consider the connexion and application of these phrases in the places where they occur, to be satisfied that they all have reference to the same thing—to "the word," to use the language of Peter, "which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ—that word which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee after John's baptism, how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power; who went about doing good—whom they slew and hanged on a tree. Him God raised up the third day—To him give all the Prophets witness that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins."

It is this annunciation which Paul, in the motto which we have prefixed to these papers, denominates "The gospel;" for in the definition which he there supplies, he enumerates in substance the same facts concerning Christ, of which Peter speaks, to wit—"that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; that he was buried, and that he rose the third day according to the scriptures." It matters not whether we say with Peter, that 'Him they slew and hanged on a tree—and that to him bear all

* It is worthy of remark that those terms which occur least frequently in the scriptures, have been most often the occasion of dispute. We may instance, "born again;" "born of Spirit;" "regeneration;" "end of the world." The reason is, that their meaning is more difficult to fix, as they occur in few passages, and with little change in their connexion and collocation.

† Compare Matth. iv. 23, and xiii. 19—23, with Mark ii. 2; iv. 14—18, and Mark xvi. 5, with ver 20; and all these with Luke v. 1; Acts ii. 41; iv. 4, 31: vi. 2, 4, 7; viii. 4, 25; x. 36, 37, 44; xi. 1; xii. 24; xiii. 26, 48; xiv. 3; xv. 7; xvi. 10; Rom x. 8; 2 Cor. iv. 2; v. 19; vi. 7; Eph. i. 13; Phil. i. 14; ii. 16; Col. i. 5; Titus i. 3, 9; Jas. i. 18.

Prophets witness that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins;' or with Paul, more briefly, 'that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures'—the prophetic scriptures of the Old Testament. It matters not whether we say with the former, "Him God raised up the third day;" or with the latter, "He rose the third day according to the scriptures." The facts to which they refer are identical and their exposition of the terms, "word," "gospel," &c. which they employ, and the application which is made of the various phrases which we have quoted from the Evangelists, enable us to perceive with infallible certainty that they are all used in reference to the leading facts of Christian history, looked at from different points and in various associations. We have only to except the Apostle John, who uses the term "word" in a peculiar and appropriated sense. This we could with facility have gathered from his writings by induction, but it is rendered unnecessary by the definition with which he has himself furnished us in the last clause of the first verse of the first chapter of his testimony.

The etymon of the term "gospel" is Saxon. It is from *godesspel*, which signifies *God's good tidings*, and nearly answers to the Greek word used by the inspired writers—*euanggelion*, good news, glad tidings. The gospel of Christ then is, The glad tidings concerning Christ.

Whether, then, we interpret the phrase according to its etymology, or take the definition furnished by the Apostles, or ascertain its import from its use in the New Testament, the result is the same. So that, finally, we have only to sum up the whole in the words of Paul, and say that the gospel is, "that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures."

These three facts, then, constitute what is truly and essentially the gospel. "Jesus was born to die," and however joyful his advent, it was so to the guilty sons of men only as the foretoken of their deliverance by his death for their sins, and his resurrection from the grave for their justification. Had Jesus come into the world only to leave an example of heavenly virtue, and return in a cloudy chariot to the skies, mankind would have remained in the same unhappy condition as before in respect to

pardon and acceptance with God. It was the shout of victory with which Jesus expired upon the cross, which communicated at once the first intimations of defeat throughout the trembling dominions of the Prince of darkness, and of joyful deliverance to the ears of sleeping saints. There can be no joy where there is no salvation. But it is not possible to conceive of any tidings so truly deserving the epithet of "joyful," as the annunciation of the facts which constitute the gospel, when these are understood in their natural relations, consequences, and tendencies.

R. R.

MR. LYND AND SPIRITUAL INFLUENCE.

I HAVE not had leisure since my return to read Mr. Lynd's late attempt to prove that "*the Holy Spirit does exert an influence in connexion with, or through the truth, in renewing sinners, which is not found in the motives themselves presented by the truth.*" "*This,*" he says, "*is the controversy.*" I have read the close of his last essay to ascertain whether he would redeem his pledges, and accept of the rules which I proposed, for a complete and final discussion of the points at issue, as he has drawn them up and expressed them in the conclusion of his last effort. He explains away, or, in truth, recalls his challenge; and declines the proposed discussion, alleging that he only "stood prepared to prove that Mr. Campbell's system subverts the fundamental doctrines of the gospel." Very good, and very orthodox, truly! Of course I stand prepared to show that *Mr. Lynd's system* "*subverts the fundamental doctrines of the gospel.*" Well, I will accept of Mr. Lynd's definition of the controversy, as above quoted in his own words, and redeem my pledge, or defend myself against his allegations. But there must be some method—some rules of discussion. I have now published *three* attempts of Mr. Lynd, with my defence. He is not yet content; but, instead of meeting me on the ground of his own challenges, which I unequivocally accepted in all their import, he has given us a *fourth* attempt, and refuses to meet me on his own allegations; unless, forsooth, I will not hold him bound by his own acknowledged confession of faith. His words are, "I shall not obligate myself to enter into any discussion hereafter, unless I can have some assurance that I shall not be metamorphosed into a confession of faith."

Well, Mr. Lynd shall not escape from his present unenviable position, under any such cloud or pretext. Let him disown the Regular Baptist Confession of Faith in the articles quoted, and I will not once more name it to him. But so long as he has solemnly vowed his faith in those words, and pledged himself to teach and preach accordingly, and so long as he quotes from my writings elicited by that Confession, I will quote from his Confession of Faith as fairly representing his views. If, then, he will candidly and explicitly disown a Confession, of which he now seems to be ashamed, I promise to quote it no more against his views. So that the removal of this difficulty is in his own power. Or if he promises to make his fourth attempt final, I will reprint and review it in the Harbinger, if he will have my reply republished in the Cross and Journal, and so close the discussion.

Mr. Lynd, then, must do one of three things, or own himself convicted of error.—1st. Disown the Confession. 2d. Meet me on his own statement of the controversy according to his challenge and the rules I proposed. 3d. Or admit my answer to his fourth attempt into the Cross and Baptist Journal as the *finale* of the whole discussion.—I am persuaded that the community needs to hear both sides of this long-litigated question fully and scripturally discussed, in a few pages. Mr. Lynd is as competent as any of the Baptist society to defend the scholastic and metaphysical theories of speculative influence. A volume of 100 pages, 50 on each side, stereotyped, and circulated by the Disciples of Christ and the Baptists as an end of the controversy, would doubtless be a desideratum.

I will accept of the controversy as drawn up by himself in his own words—as indicating an influence distinct from motives, not of motives, superadded to the motives of the gospel in renewing sinners. Let him, then, prepare himself for the discussion upon fair and equal principles, and let it be stereotyped for the purpose of cheap distribution. Thus will the bane and the antidote, the poison and the medicine, the *pro* and the *con*, the truth and the error, stand before the community side by side, and be tried on their respective merits and pretensions by all candid and inquisitive persons. Are you afraid, Mr. Lynd? Then you confess that my words of error are more powerful than your words of truth—that error is stronger than truth—inasmuch as your truth requires new and supernatural assistance, while my error by its own energy can overcome your truth. I am greatly mistaken in your character, if you would not prefer such an issue to my saying that you are weaker than I; and that the difference is not in the dogma, but in the dogmatist. A. C.

MORALITY OF CHRISTIANS—*No. XIII.*

MESSRS. GREW, BADGER, "THE CHRISTIAN PALLADIUM," AND "ANNIHILATION."

We have not finished our series of essays on the "Morality of Christians," nor on the "Kingdom of Satan." These topics were only suspended, not dismissed, because of our absence from home and the pressure of other matters. We have something yet to say on these themes. The vices of the present professors are more numerous, flagrant, and destructive to religion, than all the false tenets, opinions, and theories of a thousand years. Slander, falsehood, and detraction seem to be the most common sins of the pulpit and of the press. The Lord's day, "the sacred desk," the press, are often prostituted to the vilest purposes. The characters of men, living and dead, renowned for wisdom and goodness, are held up, like targets, to be shot at by the spiritual archers, who fill their stomachs by stabbing or aiming at the hearts of those who have been piously and humanely seeking to save men from the poison of their cup, or the moral pestilence of their breath. More than Satan are they hated who would expose their pernicious ways.

These sectarian fruits are fruits of bitterness. They are the offspring of the schismatic spirit that converted an angel into a calumniator and a false accuser of the brethren. They prove that the fruits of the spirit of partyism are the exact contrast of the fruits of the spirit of God—of "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, fidelity, meekness, and temperance"—they are anger, wrath, malice, war, &c. &c.

These sins of the pulpit and of the press, consequently of society, must be exposed, reproved, reformed. As an illustration of this spirit, the following extract from a paper, most unfortunately called "The Christian Palladium"—as if slander, falsehood, and misrepresentation were the Christian's defence, is quoted from the paper of March 15:—

"MR. GREW AND MR. CAMPBELL.

"It has been thought by many who were not intimately acquainted with the circumstances, that Mr. Campbell's Harbinger was in all cases open to both sides of the questions discussed in that paper; but this is not the case. We know of no Editor who has excluded more articles, or treated his opponents with more disrespect and unfairness, than Mr. Campbell. Elder Grew wrote him down on the subject of the Trinity some years since, and is now the second time rigorously crowded out of his columns. The following keen review sets Mr. C.'s liberality in a true light: and though we are not fully prepared to endorse all of brother G.'s opinions, yet we know some of our brethren are, and we

say under such circumstances of oppression, let as good a man, as we know brother Grew to be, speak for himself—he alone is responsible for his own sentiments.——*Editor.*"

The Editor of the aforesaid "Christian Palladium" is in theory a professed *Unitarian*-Antitrinitarian, who, of course, claims a brotherhood with Mr. Grew; and therefore Mr. Grew, in his candid opinion, wrote Mr. Campbell "down on the subject of the Trinity," &c. Well, Mr. Campbell, of course, cannot be *written up* again by Mr. Grew, nor by himself; and so it is decided that Emanuel was a mere Prophet, like Moses, only farther inspired; and that his death for our sins is only the comparative degree of Paul's and Peter's death for us. We owe, then, but a little more gratitude to Jesus than to Paul, and John Huss and Jerome of Prague; for they all died for our sins substantially in the same sense; but he more directly, but not more expiatively than they. Well, but it is the morality, and not the theology of the above extract, that now comes under our notice. I need not tell any of my regular readers that there are more downright palpable falsehoods in the above extracts than there are sentences; for of this they cannot be ignorant. Not one of my opponents has ever been deprived of a hearing in my pages. We always were, and are, and shall be open to both sides.—It is, then, positively false that our pages are shut against any one who differs from us on any question of Christian doctrine, discipline, or morality; or, which is the same thing, "that the Harbinger is not open to both sides of the questions discussed in it." It is open—equal pages are given—the same room tendered to all out of our communion who oppose any tenet or practice of ours: if we think their views are at all worthy of being opposed, we always deem them worthy of being first heard. It is also positively false "that Elder Grew has been rigorously crowded out of our columns." Where is the proof? We shall now hear Mr. Grew himself:—

"*Mr. Editor*—In the Millennial Harbinger for September, 1838, Mr. Campbell, in his reply to Mr. Skinner, noticed, in a complimentary manner, my pamphlet on future punishment. In opposition to the plain import of our Lord's teaching, Matth. x. 28., in reference to this solemn subject, that it is the divine purpose "to destroy both soul and body in hell," Mr. C. presents us with various arguments. To these arguments I forwarded a reply the same month. Brother C. having commenced the discussion of the subject, and having so often avowed his determination to "prove all things," I hoped that he would allow his readers the consideration of a few objections to his own views, courteously presented. Mr. C.'s right to decline publishing my communication is not questioned. Had he simply done this, the present article would never have been written. He has presented us with a fiction of his own ingenuity under the signature of "William Penn," who is represented as requesting a consideration of the scriptural doctrine of the

destruction of the wicked, and is classed with others of "curious and speculative fancy," who wish to be informed "what ultimately became of the pillar of salt into which Lot's wife was converted;" and of other matters, some of which are equally edifying. Such trifling with the awful subject of the penalty of Jehovah's holy law will be duly estimated by every discerning spiritual mind, without any comment of mine.

In Mr. C.'s reply, in which he addresses all the querists together, he gravely informs us, "I do not think we are liberty to occupy our minds on such themes." Why then did he occupy the minds of his readers with several pages *against* the doctrine of destruction! Why has he occupied so large a portion of the Harbinger for so long a period with the discussion with Mr. Skinner? Where he wishes to establish his own side of the question relative to "destruction," the subject, it seems, is sufficiently important; but when objections are offered to his arguments, he informs us, "We have on hand so many periodical matters of greater moment." Having written all he desired on the subject, the moment of his opponent's advancing is the precise period of the happy discovery of the "inutility of such discussions;" and that they are attended with "loss of time, labor, and money," &c. After giving his own arguments in order, and attempting to fortify them with those of "the great Dr. Edwards," he piously warns his opponent against meddling with "untaught and unprofitable questions—with abstruse, recondite, and inoperative speculations, rather than the good and wholesome doctrine which is according to godliness." How it came to pass that our brother C. made all these wonderful discoveries precisely at the same period between the *pro* and the *con* of the question, might puzzle phrenology more than common sense. He frankly remarks, "I am glad to be excused from the labor of answering a thousand and one such *puzzling* questions," &c. He seems to have thought himself to be in the dilemma of exposing himself and "the great Doctor" to rational and scriptural refutation, or of implicitly confessing that he had occupied his pages with "unprofitable questions," and "inoperative speculations." He preferred the latter

That Mr. C. had some other reasons than those his letter represents, for withholding from his readers my communication, is apparent from his own declaration in the letter which has elicited these animadversions. He remarks, "Whatever may increase our knowledge of God or of man, and of *our relations to the past, present, and future*, is both *desirable* and *useful*, and *constantly to be sought after*." Yet, an article designed to ascertain what is the scriptural doctrine concerning the future condition of the ungodly, is not simply rejected, but treated with the same respect, and assigned the same destiny with such questions as, "Which of the sons of Ham was the father of the Negroes!" I repeat it, that Mr. C.'s right to decline publishing it, is not questioned; but he is requested not to mock us with such pretexts, and to have more respect for himself, and for the holy truth, whatever he may have for us. I send you a copy of the article sent to Mr. C. Its publication in the Palladium will oblige your friend,

HENRY GREW.

Philadelphia, Pa., February 5, 1839.

Now, if this be not *ad captandum*—to inveigle the unthinking—a puff to Mr. Grew from his own pen, (perhaps without intending it,) I am at a loss to understand what it does mean. Where is the proof of my refusal to publish his communication? Does Mr. Grew offer any evidence that I ever saw or read his communication? Did he not know that I left Bethany the 8th of October last? And does he not say that he wrote his letter after the September number of the Harbinger reached Philadelphia, from which place to Bethany it was barely possible his letter could be conveyed before my departure; and that I had not returned home at the time he wrote his letter for his brother Badger? And ought he not to have been assured that I had received his letter before he took occasion to hold me up to the reproach of all the readers of a paper from whose pages he well knew I was positively proscribed? But is there no excuse for this presumption? Yes; some *five* letters on curious speculations, one of which alluded to destructionism, were all printed in the December number of the Millennial Harbinger, with a general answer from myself, declining, for certain reasons, the discussion of those subjects. On this Mr. Grew founds his invectives, supposing that he must be the "William Penn" of the December number! But would such a hypothesis justify such a volume of reproach? Did he not know that brother Silas E. Shepard and a Mr. Montgomery, of New York, had a discussion of that question in progress at that time, and that I was besought by one of the parties more than once to break silence on the subject? Why, then, should he imagine that he was 'Wm. Penn,' rather than either of those gentlemen, or some friend of either of them? Surely a more scrupulous morality would have hesitated to publish such a censure and malediction on such a hypothesis. But still more glaringly unjust is this allegation of our friend Henry Grew, inasmuch as I *did not*, even in the general reply which I gave, "decline the discussion of that question," only for a time; and I did, moreover, make a special reserve, with a special reference to one of those questions as of some "practical value;" promising, should its utility be more apparent, to attend to it after some matters on hand were disposed of. And could he not but perceive that this was that very point? From all of which, he not having heard from me any thing on the subject, we ask, How could he, as a Christian professor, so bespatter me with such unjust reproaches as those above quoted?—Such is not the morality of the gospel, as I understand it.

But as I have to-day, for the first time, read this appalling letter of Mr. Grew, I shall now lay it before my readers:—

"*Dear brother Campbell*—Far be it from me to commend to you, or to any person, any doctrine because it is "consonant to some men's theo-

ries of what is fitting for God and men." I hope, by the divine favor, I can sincerely say with you, "I go for what is evidently the meaning of scripture, or whatever is true; not for what is most plausible or palatable."

It is not my design, in this article, to attempt a full discussion or vindication of the doctrine of future punishment, as consisting in the torments of the lake of fire, terminating in the entire destruction of body and soul; a doctrine which I firmly believe to be clearly revealed in the oracles of God. I beg leave simply to reply to the arguments you have offered to our consideration in opposition to this doctrine. You observe, "With me punishment is pain," &c. "Now if punishment mean pain or torment, it cannot also mean unconsciousness," &c. The question to be considered is, whether *all* punishment consists in pain *and nothing else?* This I deny, for punishment may consist in deprivation or loss of good. If it is said that this deprivation or loss is attended with the pain of consciousness thereof, I reply, it may or it may not be. The fact of the loss is independent of such consciousness. A father promises his child, on condition of good behaviour, that he shall go in the evening to a place of rational amusement, where he will be highly delighted. He threatens him at the same time that he shall not go, but be sent to bed, if he behaves ill. The child exposes himself to the threatening, which is executed. He suffers the pain of consciousness of the loss of the happiness he might have enjoyed until he falls into a state of unconsciousness in sleep. Now I affirm that this mental pain is not *all* his punishment. It is not all that was threatened. There is an actual deprivation or loss of happiness which he would have enjoyed had he been obedient. This was a special part of the threatening. This punishment of loss is independent of the mental pain it occasioned. This is manifest by contrasting his state of unconsciousness in sleep with the felicity he might have enjoyed with his companions.

"*No feeling, no pain*, is a sure maxim;" but this does not prove that no pain, no punishment, is so. To withhold good on account of ill-doing is properly of the nature of punishment. Man's chief end is to serve and enjoy his adorable Maker forever. The loss of all the glory of immortality in the beatific presence of God, in consequence of sin, is a loss of inconceivable magnitude. It is the greatest possible punishment of loss which can be threatened by the righteous Judge; a punishment of tremendous import. What saith the scriptures of truth? "Who shall be *punished* with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." 2 Thess. i. 9. Now I submit two questions to your candid determination. 1st. Is not the loss of the glory of the divine presence and power the main idea of this passage? 2d. Is not this loss declared to be *punishment?* If the meaning of the word "destruction" in this passage is doubtful, is it not clearly determined by our blessed Lord, Matt. x. 28., to be, not a destruction of happiness only, but a destruction of body and soul?—2 Thess. i. 9., clearly teaches that the *punishment* of the wicked will be "destruction from the presence of the Lord" Now if the punishment is destruction, and destruction everlasting, does it not clearly follow that this is "everlasting punishment!"

But suppose the term "punishment" always to mean pain and nothing

else, does it necessarily follow that the term "everlasting" applied to punishment in Matth. xxvi, 46., means strictly endless, because the term is used in that sense in the same verse in application to the life of the righteous? Are the mountains, which are to be "burned up," 2 Peter iii. 10., as everlasting as the ways of the immutable Jehovah, because this term is applied to both in the same verse, Hab. iii. 6? I believe that the term is used in an unlimited sense in Matth. xxv. 46., understanding it in the sense which 2 Thess. i. 9., and Matth. x. 28. teaches—viz. "everlasting destruction." When we say that future punishment is *only* everlasting destruction, and say that it is also continued antecedent torment, your charge of our system being "suicidal" shall be admitted. At present it is believed that the charge is more justly applicable to the system that admits the scripture doctrine of the everlasting *destruction* of body and soul in hell, and also the everlasting *existence* of body and soul in hell.

I see no force in the objection of Mr. Edwards, that our view "makes eternal (*future* he should have said) punishment to be a compound of previous torment and eternal annihilation." This neither implies any thing about "the doom of infants," nor that "the least culpable sinners," will be destroyed without any previous torment, nor that annihilation is "the least punishment imaginable." The destruction of the body and soul in hell, as a punishment, is to be contrasted, *not with the torment which precedes it, but with the eternal enjoyment of the presence and glory of God, from which it forever excludes the last sinner.* So the scriptures teach, 2 Thess. i. 9. Mr. Edwards, therefore, is incorrect in saying that "to be annihilated, after a long series of torments, would be no punishment at all."* If the alternative is eternal misery or entire destruction of body and soul, the sinner chooses the latter, not because it is a punishment, or a thing in itself not to be dreaded, but because it is the least of two evils. You will please to observe that "the great Doctor" disagrees with your opinion that annihilation is *no* punishment, by admitting that it is '*the least.*' "

The only thing in this letter that I have not already noticed in the Universalian controversy is the question, Whether "*all* punishment consists in pain, and nothing else." This Mr. Grew denies, and I affirm; for his punishment of *loss* is no punishment at all, if that loss give no pain. And so ends the matter. "What the eye never sees the heart never grieves;" so says the proverb. And as there can be neither loss nor gain to an unconscious being, the moment that unconsciousness is destroyed there is an end of punishment—for there is an end of pain.

Mr. Grew might have reserved his fire till Mr. Skinner had published his last letter, for the reception of which we are still waiting.

Now as I have, in the preceding extract, republished all that I have seen of this letter in the "Christian Palladium," I now propose, as a condition of my publishing any more on the same subject from Mr. Grew, that he shall have the whole of my remarks on this affair copied into the "Christian Palladium." If he do not, we shall then see who is one-sided on the whole premises.

A. C.

* A few lines here omitted.

SCHOOLS AND EDUCATION.

NO. I.

A PERFECT system of schools and education, both in theory and practice, is still a desideratum. While we are progressing towards that attainment, evident it is the world has not yet seen such a system in actual operation. Man is not yet fully developed, because he is not perfectly educated; and he is not perfectly educated, because there exists no institution in which such an education can be obtained. The spirit of the age is, indeed, most friendly to the cause of schools and education. Much, very much has been done, and is still doing, both in Europe and America, in this most philanthropic and useful of all human undertakings.

Many correct and fundamental views have been offered to the public—many useful definitions of education; and many, very many sage maxims concerning its value and importance have been propounded to the community: still the subject is very far from being generally understood, or appreciated according to its value. We are told that a rational and good system of education is founded upon a correct view of the whole constitution of man—as a physical, intellectual, and moral being; and that it consists in a full development of the whole man in harmony with all his relations to the whole universe of which he is a part. It is fully proved that no person is well educated whose physical powers, whose understanding, and whose moral susceptibilities and powers are not trained to as much perfection as the staminal vigor of his whole constitution. But who has defined this entire *constitution* of man? Are the learned agreed upon this subject? What are man's *relations* to this mighty universe? Nay, what is that *universe* of which he is in his own eyes so important and so essential a proportion?

Had man a comprehensive knowledge of the universe, and of his own relations to that universe—had he a perfect knowledge of his own constitution in all its parts, and the best method of preserving and improving that constitution—then, indeed, he might, with some hope of success, attempt the formation of some scheme of education suited to man in all his wonderful nature and relations. But such a knowledge is, perhaps, not only unattained; but, in its full dimensions, unattainable: and certainly such a knowledge, even in the rudest outline, is not general nor common amongst those who are most devoted to the business of education. We have our grammarians, logicians, rhetoricians, linguists, mathematicians, philosophers, &c. as we have our stone-cutters, masons, bricklayers, plasterers, carpenters, painters,

and glaziers. But how few masters in one of these branches—how much fewer in a plurality of them—and who is practically conversant with them all! Hence we have not the name of a single architect who was practically skilled in all the branches necessary to the erection of a convenient and elegant villa.

Still we must not despise the day of small things; but so far as we have attained let us hold fast and progress forward. Much is doing to enlarge our conceptions of the various fields of knowledge, and to simplify and arrange these ideas in a manner most suitable and convenient both for the acquisition and communication of them; and all that we can say is, that the education of youth should always be planned and conducted according to the full measure of our knowledge of man—his place, his use, and design in the great dominions of the universe.

On these grand points the civilized world is at length being agreed. That man is the *end* of this sublunary creation, is almost universally admitted;—that he is an intellectual and moral being, susceptible of the highest rational and moral enjoyment, as well as an animal being, and capable of animal pleasures, is no longer doubted;—that his education should be all laid with an eye single to his animal, intellectual, and moral enjoyment, is equally obvious and equally accredited;—and that, as there is a subordination of the animal to the mental and moral in man, so ought there to be a subordination in his training and discipline. In one word, he ought to be so educated that his happiness would be perfect and complete to the full extent of his whole powers and susceptibilities—i. e. that his animal pleasures should be as great as they can possibly be without entrenching on his intellectual and spiritual; and that his intellectual and spiritual pleasures ought to be as great as possible, without entrenching upon his animal. But, at the same time, if any sacrifice must be made, of which there may be some doubt, then, in that case, the inferior must always yield to the superior—the brute to the man, and the man to the Christian.

I propose, then, in the following essays, first to look at the schools which are essential to the development of man. These are *four*,—the Family, the Elementary, the College, and the Church. To perfect the education of man, it is indispensable that he pass through these four, and that his moral training in each shall be the tendency and consummation of every lesson. Of the truth and necessity of all this we have no doubt that all our readers, if not already convinced, shall be fully persuaded so soon as our reasons and premises are duly before them.

A. C.

GOOD NEWS FROM MEXICO.

"Great is the truth, and mighty above all things, and must prevail!"

MR. EDITOR:

Dear Sir--ALTHOUGH I am at a very great distance from the favored spot where you reside, and in a country where anarchy and misrule, superstition and ignorance hold a *universal sway*, if I may so speak; yet it has fallen to my lot to become acquainted with your valuable publications, most of which, if not all, are in my possession. *I reside in an obscure part of the Republic of Mexico.* This piece of information will doubtless fill your heart with joy; for your writings are now being useful to the conversion and reformation of sinners, *even in this country!* Were you prepared for this, my dear sir? I doubt it. You have somewhere expressed your conviction, for which you so ably plead, "the restoration of the ancient order of things," will ultimately prevail and spread through Christendom; but that *you* did not expect to see or realize the fruits of your labors; I think it was something to this purport, for I am now absent from home, and only speak from recollection. What, then, will you say if I inform you that the ancient order and ancient gospel are about to be restored in Mexico? I presume this will exceed your most sanguine expectations; but it is nevertheless true. On the 7th instant I had the happiness of immersing three ladies, among the most enlightened and respectable in this part of the country, into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, for the remission of their sins; and am instructing two more, sisters of theirs, who will shortly, I hope, visit the Jordan. You will easily imagine what were my feelings of gratitude and adoration to the heavenly Father for the happy privilege he thus conferred on me. They were, and are still such, as you must experience when you read this, and every other good Christian into whose hands this may fall. You and they will join me in glorifying Him on account of his mercy and condescension in this case; for who can tell where this work will end?

These new disciples possess one advantage; and that is, *they know nothing of sectarianism*; and their only guide to heaven is the *Living Oracles*. They constantly study the sacred scriptures in their own language; and I, having before me the perversions of the Scarlet Mother, explain to them all passages they do not comprehend fully, according to the best of my ability. Your writings aid me greatly in this agreeable task. I find that the effect of the ancient gospel here, is the same as in the United States, or Antioch.

I have to proceed with the greatest circumspection on account of violent prejudices and opposition against me; for even *my life* was threatened not long since on account of the heretical doctrines I was teaching. Yet I replied as did Peter and the other Apostles, that 'I chose to obey God rather than man'—that where the doctrine I teach is heard with pleasure, there is no power in man to prevent my promulging it while I possess life; but that if any spurned or rejected it, I should not obtrude it on them. The result has been thus far as you see above, though none here but the parties know of it. I am of opinion, however, that the Lord will make his word triumph over all opposition of whatever kind it may be.

The political horizon of this country is quite pregnant with stormy clouds, that are just now discharging their contents. The spirit of party and the spirit of vengeance are firing the breasts of every class and condition of people. The contest, however, is unequal—*the people* against

the few—against a set of men who have ascended into power, violating the most sacred rights of the nation; who have subverted the laws framed by the fathers of our liberties, earned at the expense of their blood and treasure. The people mean to be free, and they *will* be free! They wish to establish a government that will be just and wise, and that will promote the happiness and civilization of the country—a cause worthy to be contended for, and which will doubtless triumph over the engines and machinations of tyranny and priestcraft.

It is probable that you may but seldom hear of my progress in the good work, perhaps once-a-year, on account of the great distance and precariousness of conveyance here. But whether you hear from me often or seldom, be assured, Mr. Editor, that in me you will ever have a friend and brother who will do his utmost to advance the ancient gospel in Mexico, and who will, as long as he lives, revere and admire you on account of your labors in Christ the Saviour; always remembering, with unfeigned gratitude, the blessings and privileges he enjoys through *your* instrumentality, though at so great a distance from you. Therefore, you will please accept my Christian love and salutation, and also that of the disciples at this place; and through you we offer the same to all the brethren in your communion and fellowship.

The servants of the arch enemy I know will breathe death and desolation on me when they see this, and make great efforts to find me out and make away with me; but the Lord will confound their counsels, and dissolve their hopes. Their sun is setting; and, as Bunyan says, "The Beast has now no teeth," and can now only growl horribly; so that those who know his age and circumstances, fear him not. They that trust in the Lord of hosts fear not what man can do to them; but they that trust in their own craft shall speedily be destroyed.

Excuse the many defects in the style of this letter. You will have perceived that I speak not in the language of the *learned*, but *simply* communicate to you truths that require no learning to convey, that you and the friends of Christ may have this additional reason for rejoicing in the Captain of our salvation. Please remember us in your prayers.

I am, dear sir, yours most affectionately, in the hope of immortality,

DOCTOR LUKE.

Republic of Mexico, Feb. 10, 1839.

News from the Churches.

Montevideo, Elbert county, Georgia, March 20, 1839.

I am extremely anxious to hear the result of your labors in other sections. In all this country you have accomplished much, very much—removing the prejudices of some against, prepossessing others in favor of, the ancient gospel; and producing a good effect generally in favor of the cause you plead.

Whilst I was with you, you spoke of writing an article warning the brethren of the impropriety of wearing any other name than that of Christians or Disciples of Christ. Our brethren are now scattered through the whole length and breadth of the land, and wear different names in different sections. Many seem inclined to that of Reformers; and unless you write something on the subject, I fear that will ultimately become our distinctive appellation. I am aware that you wrote much on this subject in your Christian Baptist; but these are no doubt hundreds who read the Harbinger, who have never read those articles. The sectarians are greatly incensed against those of us who call ourselves Disciples or Christians. They say we claim to be the *only* Christians. The truth of the matter I take to be this: They have abandoned the name themselves, and they feel reproached when we refuse to be called by any other.

Can you not suggest to us some Evangelist, able, eloquent, and prudent, who might be induced to visit the South? The prejudices of the community against the ancient gospel have been very much broken down by your visit; and all we need now, under the blessing of God, to reap an abundant harvest, is the labors of such an Evangelist. If you will suggest such a one, I think that, though we are poor, we can bear his expenses. Truly the harvest is plenteous and the laborers are few.

T. W. RUCKER.

Jackson, Louisiana, March 18, 1839.

This is to inform you that, owing to bad weather and other circumstances, I did not get up to Consolation until yesterday. The day being fine, we had a very crowded house. After speaking I made a proposition to enlist soldiers under the banners of King Jesus, when three came forward, which, with the four who came forward when you were there, makes seven—all of whom I immersed yesterday. Many left the place weeping. I am happy to say that your preaching there was not without much effect—more, in fact, at that place than any other from which I have heard. Sectarianism, I think, has at that point received its death stab. There is so much partyism in this place, that I am inclined to think the cause of primitive Christianity will progress but slowly.

B. L. D'SPAIN.

Georgetown, Kentucky, March 28, 1839.

I reached home from Louisville, where I had the pleasure of seeing and hearing you, evening before last. I labored two weeks in the city, and obtained forty-four excellent additions to the congregation of our Lord. The brethren discharged their duty faithfully, and they merit the assistance of the Evangelists. They are much elated; and they feel disposed to put forth their energies anew in this glorious cause. Your discourses had a wonderful effect, and I made the best use I could of the happy influence which had been produced.

Brother Morton returned to my help; but he was so unwell that he was compelled to leave for home. He immersed four persons on the Lord's day following your visit to Shelbyville. I regretted deeply that I could not be with you in Georgetown. The circumstances were imperious for me to remain, and I know you would have advised me to that course.

J. T. JOHNSON.

Erwinton, South Carolina, February 25, 1839.

Nothing of much importance to communicate. The Baptists continue to exclude their members for "heresy," as they call the adoption of the word of the Lord, as the man of our counsel. Two were excluded in this district ten days ago—one preacher in Savannah, Georgia, since we were there—and one brother in Augusta, Georgia, lately. Two joined us in Augusta from the Baptists when I was there last week. The leaven is working throughout this district.

EPHRAIM A. SMITH.

Begg's Store, Alabama, March 7, 1839.

On Lord's day last three were added, among whom brother Willis Nall, an intelligent teacher. May God speed him in the path of usefulness! The signs indicate a rich harvest, even in latitude 32. On yesterday an intelligent gentleman informed me that Paton Graves, from the pulpit, washed his handkerchief with tears *logical*, because of the "*refined infidelity of Campbellism*, which is destined to a wide sweep in despite of all effort." Poor man! Brother Campbell, you are commanded "to weep with those who weep." But may I tell this veteran of Methodism that he may belabor himself *versus* the truth until the finger of God gives the last touch to the great drama, and it will only be like the soft summer's zephyrs upon a mountain of stubborn granite; for God has written bitter things as the doom of that anarchical city, and the gates of hades cannot thwart his prophecies. Five years ago I ordered the Harbinger to the *said* Graves; and, as Doctor Grigsby informed me, he returned it, and said, 'he considered his name disgraced *merely* because it was written on the envelope.' This is equal to Judge Innate, who declared himself competent to the decision of an important case without law or testimony!!

Brother Curtis is daily expected from Tuscumbia to peregrinate the South as an Evangelist. Thank the Lord! The beloved Doctor M'Means has launched his bark *Instructor* on the high seas of gospel grace. May Israel's God pilot *her* safe through! O how condoling these!

J. A. BUTLER.

Rockport, Missouri, March 11, 1839.

We had yesterday a large concourse of people collected here, to hear our much beloved and very intelligent brother Thomas Allen; who addressed them much to the purpose, and to their edification, as appeared to us. He is a choice brother in the Lord, and is doing much good in the great cause of our Redeemer. Six persons united with us after the discourse, which makes our number not far from a hundred members.

THOMAS HART.

Springfield, Missouri, March 10, 1839.

Brother Haden came here some two or three years since to attend to the duties of his office (Register of the Land Office,) and began to preach. The opposition was, perhaps, never exceeded at any time or place. He, with some other passching brethren, succeeded in convincing several persons belonging to the sects. A congregation was organized eight miles in the country. Brother Potter and brother Harper were made bishops. I migrated hither in the month of November, 1837, and last spring we organized in town with fifteen

members. Brother Haden is our bishop, whose oratory and biblical knowledge are not surpassed in this state—allowing me to be judge. Since our organization there have been more than double the number added by confession and immersion, and from the different kingdoms contiguous—some Methodists, some Baptists, and some Cumberland Presbyterians—and I assure you that those who have joined us from these parties were amongst the most intelligent of their members. The Lord will bless Zion: he has not forgotten us in these remote ends of the earth; for we have frequently sat together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus.

J. M'BRIDE.

Centreville, Wayne county, Indiana, March 1, 1839.

I am always gratified to learn through your valuable periodical, that sinners have bowed to the peerless authority of the Messiah, by being buried with him in baptism; and believing that such news is equally grateful to the lovers of the primitive gospel, I would simply state that three worthy heads of families were immersed in a stream near this place, at two successive meetings in January. When I was yet a Pedobaptist preacher, and *occasionally* reflected on the *action*, or so called "*mode of baptism*," I generally concluded that immersion would be extremely inconvenient, and even prejudicial to the health of all engaged in it, and could not be performed without producing circumstances incompatible with the sanctity of the ordinance. But from observation and experience, I am entirely satisfied that my conclusions were incorrect. The most profound stillness and becoming solemnity marked the crowd on the bank, in the above cases of baptism. I have been informed that a thoughtful sectarian remarked rather soberly, that "if these people will go into the water in the cold month of January, what may we not expect *when warm weather comes!*" Prospects for further increase. May God bless all the consecrated brethren!

SAMUEL K. HOSHOUR.

Martinsburg, Knox county, Ohio, November 13, 1838.

On the last Saturday and Lord's day in August we held a two days' meeting, two miles to the west of this place; during which seven persons turned to the Lord and were immersed. The disciples praised God and took courage. A few days since I visited Mohickinville, and delivered three discourses, and two persons were persuaded to put on Christ. I then returned to this place, and on the 2d Lords day in October I delivered two discourses—one at 11 o'clock and one at candle-lighting. At the close of the last two happy converts made the good confession, and were immersed the same hour of the night. On the 3d Saturday and Lord's day in October I attended the co operation meeting in Kenton, Ohio. A number of proclaiming brethren were in attendance. During the meeting six persons turned to the Lord. On last Lord's day I preached about 4 miles from this place: at the close of the discourse I gave an invitation to the disobedient to put on Christ, when one man came forward and confessed the Lord, and we repaired to the water and I immersed him. Thus you see the glorious cause for which you and others are pleading is still on the march in this section of the country. We have some noble-minded disciples in this part of the county, who are determined to support the gospel. We have some few, and only a few, who oppose co-operation. And, brother C., let me tell you, there are a few proclaimers of talent who oppose the co-operation of the churches advocated in the Harbinger. I want you to lift your pen once more, and put a sharp point to it, and give us another essay on this subject, and put down the Lilliputians who oppose this great matter.

DAVID G. MITCHELL.

Vernon, Indiana, November 29, 1838.

The truth is prevailing in this region. Brother Newton Short is now with us, and has immersed about 24 persons within one month. May the good Lord grant that we may have more faithful laborers, public and private, in his vineyard.

J. B. NEW.

Williamsville, New York, October 29, 1838.

Brother Shepard and myself visited the few disciples in Vermont. There were 27 enlisted during our stay. The truth travels very slow in this northern region.

JOHN M. BARTLETT.

Daviess county Kentucky, September 25, 1838.

Since I have been a subscriber for the Millennial Harbinger, we have organized and added about 60 disciples on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone. I have found many a good lesson in the Harbinger to tell to a dying people. We would greatly rejoice if some of the teaching brethren would direct their course this way.

SAMUEL HAYNES.

Williamsville, New York, November 21, 1838.

We built a meeting-house, 45 by 30 feet, in this place, last summer, and held a several days' meeting in it a few days ago; at which time there were twelve introduced into the kingdom of heaven, and prospects good for more. Brother Silas E. Shepard was the principal speaker. Brother J. M. Bartlett was also here; but took sick, so that he was unable to preach.

BENJAMIN HERSHEY.

Paris, Kentucky, November 19, 1838.

On the Friday before the first Lord's day in this month, I, with several others, commenced a several days' meeting at New Bethlehem. Twelve came forward—nine for immersion. Brethren White, Moore, M'Cormick, and Stivers were present. There was great joy among the saints.

On the second Lord's day, at my meeting at Paris, there were two immersed.

Brother Stivers authorized me to state, that within the last year, in the counties of Clark, Estill, and Madison, in which himself and John R. White have labored, upwards of one hundred persons have been added by faith and baptism: and that at a late meeting held on Slate, in Montgomery county, nineteen persons made the good confession, and put on the Lord.

A. RAINES.

Evansville, Indiana, January 1, 1839.

I have long thought that I would write to you of the want of the knowledge of the true gospel here. There are no reformers here but my wife and myself. We came here a year ago from Cincinnati, and feel that it would be a source of much comfort if those of our society, who may be travelling past, would call on us. I see pressing solicitations for you to visit many places beyond us: if God please to send you this way, we should be happy to see you.

We have a pleasant and growing town, and, I think, a field for the reformation. We have many privileges here, but gospel privileges; and though it is at all times our happiness to enjoy these, we feel at a loss for the society of those with whom we can safely exchange the sentiments which we feel of joy and grief—happiness or misery. Not to weary you with things that you are familiar with, I will only say, that, by recommending our situations to the brethren, it may be the means of happiness to us, as well as relief to many a bond sinner.

R. W. DUNBAR.

Euclid, Cuyahoga county, Ohio, February 13, 1839.

We have just closed an eight days' meeting, attended by that excellent brother John Henry. Seven were immersed, among whom I had the pleasure of introducing my sister and her daughter into the kingdom of Jesus. Three others were added, who had been immersed. We had truly a time of rejoicing. I think it was one of the best meetings we ever had in this place. We had a crowded house and attentive hearers. We may safely say, that the good seed is sown in the hearts of many, and we anticipate ere long to reap a rich harvest. The next Lord's day three more were immersed for the remission of sins.—May the Lord bless the labors of brother John Henry, that he may turn many to righteousness and receive a crown of rejoicing in the kingdom of Jesus! and God shall have the praise through Jesus Christ.

W. O'CONNER.

Baltimore, Maryland, January 31, 1839.

In the last holidays two of our brethren went to visit a brother and sister who had formerly lived in this city, but now reside at New London Cross Roads in the state of Pennsylvania, about 70 miles from this. This brother and sister, though by themselves, were in the practice of commemorating the death of our Lord Jesus on the first day of the week. Though alone, and feeble folks, yet this ordinance was kept. The visiters from this called the attention of the people of the neighborhood to the gospel and ancient order of things. Five were immersed, and four intelligent persons from the Baptists joined. Hence, with the first named brother and sister, there is a little body of eleven disciples in that place, professing to obey the Lord in worshipping him. Religious worship, disjoined from justice and virtue, can on no account whatever find acceptance with the Supreme Being; because it is for the sake of man that worship is required, that he may be rendered better and acquire those pious and virtuous dispositions in which his highest improvement consists. Our brethren were from home not more than seven days. We have heard from these dear brethren since: they have been visited by brother R. Ferguson of Virginia, and one of the brethren of this church, who gives a good account of their well-doing.

We are going on comfortably—no discord nor confusion; but peace and love prevail. One was immersed, and one who had been amongst the Calvinists, a promising man, joined this month. Our brother Coleman, from Charlottesville, Va., was with us, and the brethren from Philadelphia part of the month of December last.

WILLIAM CARMAN.

Grant county, Wisconsin Territory, January 30. 1839.

There are a few disciples located here. We met on the second Lord's day in October, when eleven of us united together, taking the New Testament for our guide to the New Jerusalem, where troubles cease and the weary are at rest. Two more have joined since. Would to God that our brethren in the States would send us a proclaimer, or some of them take a notion to make this their home; for the harvest is truly great and the labrers few. I know of but one proclaimer in the reformation in this territory, and he has bad health; he lives some 25 or 30 miles distant from us.

PHILIP R. CAMPBELL.

Mount Gilead, Marion county, Ohio, February 13, 1839.

After a tedious tour to the West, I have arrived at home, and seat myself to give you some information respecting the progress of reformation in this section of country.—During the year 1838, for which period I was appointed to ride as an evangelist, there have been added to the Lord nearly one hundred persons. I have been chosen again by the same churches to labor for the present year, and I feel humbly confident that if the brethren will do their duty many will be added to the saved. Lord grant that the standard of truth may be unfurled in every land!

WILLIAM DOWLING.

☞ We have some strictures on *Christianos* to offer; but as we would not prejudge him, nor decide for our readers till they have heard him, we shall reserve our review till he has done. Meanwhile, let him be heard with candor, as he is a candid man, and then we shall try his reasonings. A. C.

PROSPECTUS

OF THE

LITERARY AND MISCELLANEOUS MAGAZINE.

This work is not designed to be the advocate of Sectarianism, nor the organ of proscriptive Partyism; but, on the contrary, as its name imports, it will be devoted to literature and general miscellany. It will be a medley, embracing every variety of topics consistent with the character of such a work. As the benefit of the reader is its principal object, and truth its chief aim, it will closely investigate and scrutinously examine all subjects consistent with its nature and design It will fearlessly advocate TRUTH, and boldly expose ERROR wherever found, and under whatever garb manifested. This attack, however, will be directed against *Principles, and not Men.* The wise saying, *Hear the other party*, will always be borne in mind. To this end, every one, as far as limits will allow, shall have the privilege of presenting his views to the public through the pages of the Magazine, provided he does not outrage common courtesy

Much excellent matter will be gleaned from the labors of several distinguished men of liberal minds, who rank high among renowned critics; and much aid is expected from respectable and intelligent correspondents, whose age, experience, and literary attainments entitle them to a candid, fair, and impartial hearing In short, the Editor will use every exertion to make it a useful and valuable periodical, suitable for every class of readers. Subservient to this design, in the course of the work the following subjects will receive attention:—

1. The utility, importance, and advantage of a good education.
2. "The inadequacy of the present systems of education to develope the powers of the human mind. and to fit and prepare man for happiness and social enjoyment."
3. The probability and necessity of a thorough reformation in the present systems of education
4. A close investigation and critical examination of the subject of English Grammar.
5. The incompatibility of several systems of English Grammar with the genius of our language, and their incompetency to impart a *correct* knowledge of our vernacular tongue.
6. "Occasional notices of other works, including reviews of new works, bearing on any one of the subjects within our precincts."
3. Give a passing notice of events and occurrences of the day.

In short, every thing and any thing, tending to interest or amuse the reader, shall be deemed the lawful province of the Magazine.

With these general statements concerning the design and the course which it means to pursue, we commit the Magazine to the wave of public patronage, firmly relying on a generous and humane public for support, particularly those who prize mental improvement higher than all earthly emoluments—who had rather see this nation prosperous, intelligent, and happy. than see any party rule the people distracted by division, feuds, and intestine broils.

CONDITIONS.

I The Magazine will be a monthly periodical, neatly printed on good paper, in quarto form, suitable for preservation

II. The first number to be issued as soon as a sufficient number of subscribers can be obtained to justify the undertaking.

III. All who obtain and pay for five subscribers in advance, shall have one copy *gratis.*

IV. No subscription received for a shorter period than one year.

V. All who fail to notify a discontinuance *two months* before the close of a volume, will be considered subscribers for the next volume.

All letters, addressed *post-paid*) to the Editor, Lebanon, Wilson county, Tennessee, will receive prompt attention.

TERMS—One Dollar in advance, or $1,50 within six months from the time of issuing the first number.

N. B. Subscribers should be specific in naming the *Post-Office, County,* &c. to which they wish their papers sent.

JAMES T. LAMBETH.

Wilson county, Tenn., December 1838.

MUSIC BOOK.

A. S. HAYDEN has published a second edition of his MUSIC BOOK, revised and corrected, with an addition of about twenty tunes. Orders for it, or the publications of *A. Campbell*, may be forwarded to FORRESTER & CAMPBELL, No. 117, Wood street Pittsburg, Pa.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER,

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME III.——NUMBER VI.

BETHANY, VA. *JUNE*, 1839.

SUPERNATURAL FACTS.

AN ADDRESS, *delivered by* A. CAMPBELL, *to the* MAYSVILLE LYCEUM, *on Monday evening, the 25th March*, 1839, *and published by the unanimous request of the Institution.*

GENTLEMEN—

IN testimony, not merely of my sense of the honor you have done me, in unanimously electing me an honorary member of your Institution, nor of the high regard which I entertain for such of your association as I have the pleasure personally to know; but rather in proof of the high estimate I have formed of the great and useful objects of your Lyceum, do I at this time appear before you. On every other account I should certainly at this time have declined a task for which I am so ill qualified.—Fatigued as I am with the labors of a six months' tour, only closed this forenoon in this city, and not having had an hour to arrange my thoughts on any subject since I received from your committee an invitation to address you; I should, in justice to myself, as well as to the expectations expressed by the large assemblage before me, have deferred this address to a more convenient and propitious season. But, as in the routine of the reigning manners and customs of society, we sometimes make visits of friendship, as well as fashionable visits, I prefer to appear before you in the guise of the former, rather than in the disguise of the latter. In the one case dress and display are supreme; in the other, the frank and unadorned congratulations and communications of friendship and of the social feelings have the ascendancy. Without the corsets and trappings of a set speech and a fashionable address, I propose, then, gentlemen, to offer you a few practical and useful remarks connected with the great object of your association—viz. "*Mental and Moral Improvement.*"

Among the useful institutions of this age of improvement, I think the village and the city Lyceums occupy a very prominent and a very large space. When well conducted, and in reference to the object you propose, they constitute, in my judgment, at least half the advantages of a collegiate course of instruction. Aided by a good library, and governed by the decorum of a polite and rational administration, young men especially may derive from them many and great advantages, not only in compensation of the want of a liberal education, but even in superaddition to all the benefits usually derived from it.

Well then, gentlemen, as you have very wisely organized with a supreme regard to your mental and moral advancement, permit me to invite your attention to a subject of transcendant importance, involving in it the genuine radices of all intellectual and moral superiority. That subject is *the nature and use of supernatural facts*. This, as you have no doubt frequently observed, is an age of facts against hypotheses, and of the inductive process of inferring the laws of things from facts observed and classified; and therefore all that is now dignified with the name of science is the knowledge of facts and of the inferences logically drawn from them. As there is but one great truth in the universe, and all truths are but fractional parts of that sublime and incomprehensible truth; so there is, indeed, but one science, of which all the varieties of human knowledge are but so many component parts. There is neither an isolated fact nor science in this great universe. They run into each other, and mutually lend or borrow light, illustration, or proof from one another.

The classification of science most convenient and philosophical is that which arranges human knowledge according to the facts of which it treats. Thus, as we have physical, intellectual, and moral facts, generically speaking, we can only have physical, mental, and moral sciences. The knowledge of things physical, mental, and moral, are therefore the metes and boundaries of all our scientific attainments.

But, besides these facts, which are the basis of all human science, there is another class of facts mysterious and sublime beyond comparison, which, for the want of a more distinctive name, we have called *supernatural facts*. These, as has been stated, constitute the theme of our present address.

How, then, shall we define this word *supernatural?* You say, gentlemen, 'It literally means *above nature*.' But still the wonder grows—and we are asked, 'What is *nature?*' The answer commonly given is, '*The usual course*;' or, '*The established order of things*.' Supernatural, then, would indicate something above the reach or power of the established connexion of things. The established order of things is not to be entrenched upon, nor

violated, nor even suspended by any one who is himself a subject of those laws. Hence none but the Author of nature, or a being not a subject of the laws of nature, can either suspend or control any of her laws or arrangements. Supernatural facts are, then, facts superior to the powers of nature—facts above the established order of things—facts which can only be performed by a hand that can control, suspend, or annihilate the laws of nature. All facts, therefore, that are clearly not the effect of any law of nature, but contrary, or superior to these laws, we call supernatural: such as a person's walking in the midst of a burning fiery furnace without the slightest injury, or upon the tops of the waves of a tempestuous sea, as upon a rock, or curing natural diseases, or raising to life a dead person by speaking a word.

I need not tell you, gentlemen, that the reality of such facts is denied, and that, too, by some of our shrewd and speculative philosophers; nay, farther, there are some who teach that if such facts did happen, no sort of evidence could sustain them, because more probable and more credible that the witnesses are mistaken, than that the event or fact reported should have occurred. With a few there is no power above nature—Nature is omnipotent, self-existent, and eternal. These are not to be reasoned with; and, therefore, they are not at present within our jurisdiction. We now reason with them who contemplate nature not as a first cause—"a cause uncaused;" but as an effect of one intelligent and almighty agent.

Next to Newton, *La Place* ranks in the philosophy of nature. He was decidedly sceptical. He denies supernatural facts altogether. So did David Hume. These are the two greatest names on the list of sceptics. Their philosophy is standard and canonical in all the high schools of infidelity. If, then, we can show their philosophy to be at fault, false and chimerical, foolish and absurd, on this subject, we shall, I trust, be excused from wrestling with inferior spirits—mere freshmen in their school. On this occasion, then, we shall contend with none else but these two great masters of the hosts of scepticism. I have to prove the existence of supernatural facts; and my first task shall be to show that the sceptical philosophy is based on a false hypothesis, and consequently a gross and even a palpable delusion.

We shall first hear La Place state his own argument against revelation:—"The probability of the *continuance* of the laws of nature is, in our estimation, superior to every other evidence, and to that of historical facts the best established. One may judge, therefore, the weight of testimony necessary to prove a suspension of those laws, and how fallacious it is in such cases to apply the common rules of evidence."

Now the strength and point of this philosophy is, that the pro-

bability that the laws of nature have always continued and shall continue as they are, is superior to the evidence of sense, the evidence of testimony, and every other evidence by which we prove any fact whatever. If, then, we had walked through the channel of the Red Sea after Moses, or seen the rock Horeb turned into a fountain of water at the bidding of the Prophet; if we had seen the three sons of the Captivity walking in the midst of the fiery furnace, breathing in flame; or Lazarus rising out of his grave, on the fourth day, at the command of the Christian Lawgiver, we should rather believe that our eyes, and ears, and senses had deceived us, than doubt the probability that the laws of nature continued in these cases to operate as they had always done. Is there not, then, but one short step between the assumption of La Place and absolute and universal scepticism of even the laws of nature themselves? For let me ask even the sons of scepticism, On what sort of evidence does our assent to this "probability" rest? or, rather, By what sort of evidence do we learn the laws of nature? Is it not by the testimony of our senses? If, then, I believe my senses while they, at one time, attest the regularity of the laws of nature, why should I disbelieve them when in a particular case, or in a number of cases, they depose that the laws of nature are suspended, violated, or changed? Why should the senses in this arbitrary way be metamorphosed into true or false witnesses to suit the emergency of a philosopher! Now we, who believe in supernatural facts, or facts above the regular continuance of the laws of nature, and which those laws can by no possibility achieve, admit the testimony of our senses as true and faithful in both cases. Judge then, gentlemen, which of the two schemes is most rational and consistent—that which uniformly credits the senses as faithful witnesses; or that which, according to the emergency of the case, whimsically and arbitrarily makes them true or false witnesses at the demand of a favorite theory! And is it not evident that he who discredits the testimony of the senses in any case, in which they unequivocally and concurrently depose a fact, natural or supernatural, aims a fatal blow at the foundation of all certainty, natural and moral—at the foundation of all science, material and mental?

But to come to still closer quarters with this great sage of nature's laws, let me ask, Whence the evidence of the probability of the continuance of these laws of nature? Is not the scepticism of the philosopher in supernatural facts clearly based upon a most fallacious hypothesis? Who has proved the uninterrupted continuance, or the much boasted uniformity of the laws of the universe? It is a baseless assumption, and obviously contrary to the evidence of both sense and reason, especially when they are permitted to extend their researches through all the fields of human science, limited though they be.

If nature's laws are uniform and permanent without the intervention of a supernatural agency; if all things continue as they were from eternity—all science is hypothetical—astronomy and geology, with all the physical sciences, are without facts and without reason. But they are not; therefore, we have all the physical facts against the hypothesis of the sceptic, and in proof of facts supernatural. Let us, then, hear what the sciences already named depose against the sceptical hypothesis. What saith Geology? Does she prove that all things continue as they were? Does she depose the uninterrupted continuance of the laws of nature?

We shall first hear the testimony of Mr. Lyell, the President of the British Geological Society, in his anniversary address to the Society, for 1837:*—

"All geologists will agree with Dr. Buckland, that the most perfect unity of plan can be traced in the fossil world, the modifications which it has undergone, and that we can carry back our researches distinctly to times antecedent to the existence of man. We can prove that man had a beginning, and that all the species now contemporary with man, and many others which preceded, had also a beginning; consequently, the present state of the organic world has not gone on from all eternity, as some philosophers have maintained."

To this I may add the testimony of Dr. Buckland himself, author of the Bridgewater Treatise on this most interesting science. His words are, "All observers" of the mechanism of the earth, "admit that the strata" of which it is composed "were formed *beneath the waters*, and have been subsequently converted into dry land." p. 44.

To these two distinguished witnesses we shall add the testimony of a still more deservedly renowned name—one of the three greatest men of the present century, that have flourished in the French Metropolis, and near the Court of that great nation. I allude to Cuvier, and his distinguished friends Mons. Cousin and Guizot. These three deserve the admiration and the gratitude of that nation and all lovers of religion and science. Gentlemen, let me recommend to you the late work of Mons. Guizot on the progress of European civilization. I have read it with pleasure and profit. It traces, with the hand of a master, the agencies and elements that have conspired in the present civilization of the world. While I would not endorse for every sentiment in the works of these great masters in philosophy and science, I cannot but regard them and their works as a blessing to that volatile, vivacious, but great and distinguished nation.

* Not having the works herein quoted with me, the substance was only given from my recollections in the extemporaneous address.

They have greatly contributed to redeem France from the theoretic atheism of the Voltaire and Volney school, and to convert its seminaries to a theism not only tending to good morals and good government, but to emancipate the people from the superstition and follies of the Papacy, and to propitiate their ears to the religion of the Bible. And, ladies, permit me to say for your consolation and encouragement, that all the piety of these great authors, and the good tendency of their numerous and elegant productions are to be traced to the religious affections and pious trainings of one of their mothers, Madame Cuvier, at whose house the other two, when lads, were accustomed to visit in the days of their juvenile amusements. She, good woman, was accustomed to take every occasion to imbue their minds with a deep and abiding sense of the being and perfections of God as displayed in all his works, and in his word—and to lead them "to look through Nature up to Nature's God."

From this digression let us turn over to the testimony of Cuvier in his most splendid system of Geology:—

"The lowest and most level parts of the earth exhibit nothing, even when penetrated to a very great depth, but horizontal strata or layers composed of substances more or less varied, and containing almost all of them innumerable marine productions. Similar strata, with the same kind of productions, compose the lesser hills to a considerable height. Sometimes the shells are so numerous as to constitute of themselves the entire mass of the rock; they rise to elevations superior to every part of the ocean, and are found in places where no sea could have carried them at the present day, under any circumstances; they are not only enveloped in loose sand, but are often enclosed in the hardest rocks. Every part of the earth, every hemisphere, every continent, every island of any extent exhibits the same phenomenon. It is the sea which has left them in the places where they are now found. But this sea has remained for a certain period in those places; it has covered them long enough, and with sufficient tranquility to form those deposites, so regular, so thick, so extensive, and partly so solid, which contain those remains of aquatic animals. The basin of the sea has therefore undergone one change at least, either in extent or in situation; such is the result of the *very first search*, and of the *most superficial examination*."

"The traces of revolutions become still more apparent and decisive when we ascend a little higher, and approach nearer to the foot of the great chains. There are still found many beds of shells; some of these are even thicker and more solid; the shells are quite as numerous and as well preserved, but they are no longer of the same species. The strata which contain them are

not so generally horizontal; they assume an oblique position, and are sometimes almost vertical. While in the plains and low hills it was necessary to dig deep in order to discover the succession of the beds, we here discovered it at once by their exposed edges, as we follow the valleys that have been produced by their disjunction."

"These inclined strata, which form the ridges of the secondary mountains, do not rest upon the horizontal strata of the hills which are situate at their base, and which form the first steps in approaching them: but, on the contrary, dip under them, while the hills in question rest upon their declivities. When we dig through the horizontal strata in the vicinity of mountains whose strata are inclined, we find these inclined strata reappearing below; and even sometimes, when the inclined strata are not too elevated, their summit is crowned by horizontal ones. The inclined strata are therefore older than the horizontal strata; and as they must necessarily, at least the greatest number of them, have been formed in a horizontal position, it is evident that they have been *raised*, and that this change in their direction has been effected before the others were superimposed upon them."

"Thus the sea, previous to the disposition of the horizontal strata, had formed others, which, by the operation of problematical causes, were broken, raised, and overturned in a thousand ways; and as several of these inclined strata which it had formed at more remote periods rise higher than the horizontal strata which have succeeded them and which surround them, the causes by which the inclination of these beds was effected had also made them *project above the level of the sea*, and formed islands of them, or at least shoals and inequalities; and this must have happened, whether they had been *raised* by one extremity, or whether the depression of the opposite extremity had made the waters subside. Thus is the second result not less clear nor less satisfactorily demonstrated than the first, to every one who will take the trouble of examining the monuments on which it is established."—*Cuvier's Theory of the Earth*, vol. v. pp. 8—10.

May we not now ask, How can these plain, sensible, and incontrovertible facts of geology, stereotyped in rocks and mountains, clearly legible to the eye of science, be reconciled to the hypothesis of the sceptic—that "the probability of the continuance of the laws of nature is superior to every other evidence"—when, in fact, there is no evidence of the continuance of the said laws of nature for any great length of time; but the evident tokens of a series of supernatural facts, answering to the series of creative acts recorded by Moses. He says, "The earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

And God separated the waters, and the dry land appeared." Peter says, when speaking of our present scoffers, that this wilfully escapes them who say that "all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation"—"This wilfully escapes them, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water; by which water the old earth perished," &c. Geology is proving this by tables of rock, by stratas of earths, by the indurated remains of progressive creations, showing that at least six grand generic *fiats* originated and ordered the dominions of nature so far as pertains to our terraqueous inheritance. There is no bribing of these fossil witnesses—no counterfeiting of these imprinted rocks—these tables engraven by the finger of God; a portion of which, exclusively a petrefaction of sea shells, I picked up the other day in this county of Mason; and if I were permitted to conclude from the pavements of your streets and the excavations from the bottoms of your wells, I would say that you, gentlemen and ladies, live and move and have your being on an immense bed of sea shells deposited ages since by the movements of a shoreless ocean, now converted into Limestone;* whose upper surface, by the action of atmospheric agents, has mouldered down to dust; and from which, mingled with vegetable deposites, the beautiful frames around me have, by another marvellous process, been reared and animated by the omnipotent hand of the Creator. Yes, gentlemen, I read on the deeply imprinted volumes of God's earth, in your own city and county, the refutation of the theory of La Place, and all of that school, who affirm that all things have continued in one uniform system of nature from some dateless eternity, alike unknown to reason and record.

From the geological premises now before us, and I believe they are the most scientifically orthodox, though as nothing, compared with the masses of documents and stratas of evidence within our reach; still, from these premises the following conclusions are inevitable:—

1. *The present earth was formed under water.* Geology, and the Bible, Moses and Peter agree in this testimony. This fact is most prolific of facts subversive of the sceptical philosophy.—For, in the second place, the vegetable and animal structures and creations, requiring atmosphere, did not, could not, possibly exist from the beginning. Therefore a new class of supernatural facts, or a new series of supernatural operations, must have succeeded the first system of nature, before the *fiat* which separated the waters above and under the firmament, and which caused the dry land and the pure air to appear?

3d. The creation, then, of all the vegetable genera and species,

* The primitive name of Maysville.

each of which is a special operation, a new suspension, violation, or deviation of the then laws of nature, next ensued, and became a distinct category of supernatural facts—a new system of nature.

4th. Then, when the vegetable dominions were finished, the earth clothed and filled with provisions for animal creations, a new series of supernatural interpositions was required to fill the air, the sea, and the earth with inhabitants, requiring vegetable productions mediately or immediately for their subsistence. This occasioned more supernatural facts.

5th. And even yet the work was not complete; for there was no being of earthly creation that could read or understand, or enjoy either the Creator or his creation; and this called forth those divine energies that called man into existence.

Without farther details you will perceive, gentlemen, how baseless the hypothesis that nature's laws, operations, and powers have continued always as they now are. Nothing can be more absurd; consequently, nothing can be plainer to the candid unsophisticated mind, than that there is a class of facts as properly styled supernatural, or miraculous, as that there are physical facts for the foundation of physical science. What more evident than that there was one man who was never born—a person that spoke who was never spoken to by man—an oak that never sprang from an acorn—and trees innumerable that never sprang from seeds? Or, will the sceptic prefer to say that there was a child without a father—speech before persons—eggs before birds, and seeds before trees? On either hypothesis, miracles or super natural facts are conceded as true and undeniable; and therefore La Place's hypothesis of the uniformity and continuance of the laws of nature falls prostrate to the dust. Dare any philosopher affirm that nature continues to operate as she began? Why, then, does she not annually cast up new genera and species, and begin new races of plants, animals, and men? May we not then conclude that the probability of the long continuance of the present system of nature is fairly shown to be rather a fond hypothesis than an ascertained fact?

But the facts of geology are sustained and illustrated by astronomical observations; so far, indeed, as the conglomeration of our planet, and, I might add, so far as the Mosaic account of the creative processes are implicated.

The two Herschels, Sir William and Sir John, have greatly enriched astronomical science by their many splendid discoveries and speculations on the construction and architecture of the heavens. By the aid of their immense telescopes, of from 10 to 40 feet in length, they have ascertained that stars are still forming, and the remote fields of space are filling up with new systems of suns and their satellites. "A shining fluid," rare and

cloud-like, or nebulous, in immense masses, sometimes of a pale milky appearance, diffused over millions of miles, and of immense depth, like a curdling liquid, thickens, and from being "without form and void," gradually assumes a globular appearance, thickens down into less dimensions, and finally shines as a star occupying but a speck, a shining point in a region which it once filled with its cloud-like appearance. Stars are counted up to thousands, in different states of perfection, from shapeless masses of nebulae to sparkling orbs of various magnitudes. They are said to resemble one another in their approaches to perfection, as an infant in its annual progress to manhood resembles a perfect man. "In the first and rudest state," Nicolls in his Architecture of the Heavens has said, the nebulous matter is characterized by great *diffusion;* the milky light is spread over a large space so equally that scarcely any peculiarity of construction or arrangement can be perceived." The perfectly chaotic modification of this matter on its first appearance, or original form, resembles vapor thinly spread, some spots thicker and more luminous than others. So Moses describes our planet—"And the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the mass; and the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters."*

We cannot now detail what astronomers have said on the gradual condensation of these amorphous nebulosities into globular masses, nor of the increased brilliancy which follows a change of structure. May it suffice to say, their matter seems gradually to fall under the same laws of gravitation and motion which govern our system; but in the first instance one of their diurnal revolutions may occupy thousands of years, while as they condense into more solid and less bulky masses, their motion increases until their days, like those of our planet, from thousands of years are reduced to a few hours. Hundreds of instances given by our greatest astronomers, confirm the truth of this statement, and show that the matter of these stars, by this rotatory motion, is separated and gradually solidified into a globe.

If any one should doubt the power of glasses to bring such objects under our vision, to him we should say that the largest telescopes do penetrate into distances perfectly beyond the limits of even our imaginations. The diameter of the orbit of our earth is about one hundred and ninety millions of miles; and, making it a sort of measuring rod, it is calculated that our largest glasses can descry luminous objects almost four hundred times more remote than Sirius, which is distant from our earth about thirty-six billions of miles.

* Keith, after quoting from Nicols as above, says, "Nebulae or nebulous matter, i. e cloud or cloudy, may be said to be identified with waters, designated as without form and void Water in a void or diffused state, is vapor or cloud; hereby denoting a harmony of expression between Moses and the astronomers for a state of matter for which human language, as they confess, has no name."

It would be foreign to our object to institute a comparison between the discoveries of modern astronomers and the record of Moses concerning the first state of the heavens and the earth, and the gathering together of our globe. I will only say that, as in geology, so in astronomy, the nigher we approach the truth, the more complete the evidence that no person in the times of Moses could have given such a description of the heavens and the earth, unless guided by the unerring hand of omniscient wisdom.

We have made this reference to the diffused nebulosities, those chaotic vaporous masses which contain within them the seeds and elements of new suns and systems, and which in process of time are rolled up, condensed, and solidified into globes like ours, and fitted up for the production and residence of numerous and greatly diversified inhabitants, to show,—that when Moses says the old earth was without form and void, and enveloped in darkness, and that God separated the waters above and below the firmament, and darkness and light, and finally made the dry land appear, he only speaks in accordance with the modern discoveries of the great masters of astronomical science. And for another purpose, of greater interest with many—with a reference to the length of the six days, or the much higher antiquity that some geologists assign to our earth, compared with what is understood to be the Mosaic account of this matter. It is alleged that the fossil remains, deposites, and formations discovered in this earth, argue an antiquity many thousand years beyond the period which Moses assigns to its origin, not yet full six thousand years. But to say that the time from darkness to darkness, or from light to light, called "evening and morning," is necessarily of one length is as unwarranted from the Bible as it is from analogy, or from the changes which must have happened to the vaporous mass, formless and void, of which this globe was formed. Is there any ball in motion—any wheel in the universe, that performs its first rotatory motion in the same time in which it performs even its second, to say nothing of its motion when under the full influence of all the agencies and impulses which are then in co-operation upon it? This would be a supernatural fact indeed! The earth now revolves upon its axis in twenty-four hours; but that it must have occupied no more time when it was an immense volume of vapor spread over a thousand million of times its present occupancy of space, and uninfluenced by the same laws that now govern it, would be a preposterous conclusion, a supernatural fact of marvellous import. While, then, the last days of the creation week may have been no more than 24 hours, the first two or three may have been 24,000 years, for any thing which science or the Bible avers on the subject.

But all this is a free-will offering, uncalled for by the oracles of faith or of reason—by the word of God or the scientific researches in either of the departments of geology or astronomy. When any one argues from the length of time necessary to the formation of all the strata of earths and rocks with which the earth abounds, against its being created in six common days, he resembles a brother sceptic that argues against the fact of the first man's being an adult the first moment he saw the sun, because the formation of the bones and sinews, the muscles, arteries, and nerves of an adult require some twenty-five or thirty years to develope and confirm. To such driveling philosophers we say, if God by one word could raise up in perfection one man, could he not by one word raise up this earth in all its developements—though now, as in the case of man, many years might be necessary, by the operations of the common laws of nature, to such a wonderful consummation! We conclude, then, that there is nothing in true philosophy or in true science against supernatural facts, on the ground assumed by La Place, in his false hypothesis concerning the continuance of the laws of nature; but, on the contrary, both geology and astronomy, when fairly and impartially considered, compel the conclusion that various systems of nature must have preceded the present; and to the commencement of each a divine or supernatural interposition was absolutely necessary.

As an astronomer, La Place deposes against himself: for, according to him, "the primitive fluidity of the planets is clearly indicated by the compression of their figure conformably to the laws of the mutual attraction of their molecules; it is moreover demonstrated by the regular diminution of gravity as we proceed from the equator to the poles. The state of primitive fluidity to which we are conducted by astronomical phenomena is also apparent from those which natural history points out."*

As La Place endorsed for David Hume, alleging somewhere that he was the first writer who had fairly and correctly propounded the connexion between the evidence drawn from universal experience and the evidence of testimony—who had, in one word, declared that *miracles are incredible because the laws of nature are inviolable*—we need not assign much place to the consideration of his objections to supernatural facts, they being identical with those of the great Materialist already examined. Still, as Hume is the real author of that philosophy which makes it equally impossible for God to work a miracle as for man to believe it, he deserves a more formal notice at our hand than we have yet given him. La Place's immutable and eternal continuance of the laws of nature, and Hume's inviolability of these

* La Place's System of the World, vol. ii., p. 365.

laws, are identical propositions. If, then, the Creator of man desired to communicate with him, either by word or sign, on the assumption of these two mighty infidel chiefs, whose dogmas are the boast of all the French and English sceptics of the present day, he could not do it: for that would be to violate the inviolable laws—that would be to break up their eternal continuance. Revelation is, therefore, impossible to God himself; and the glorious consummation of the philosophy of this school is, that man has more power to reveal himself to man, or even to the animals around him, than God himself. Man, then, is condemned to eternal ignorance of his origin and destiny, and of the will of his Creator, if nature's laws are inviolable, and God cannot suspend them. This, then, methinks would be absurd enough for even the sceptical philosophers themselves.

But Mr. Hume could not "*believe any testimony that is contrary to universal experience*," *because it is infinitely more probable that the witnesses are mistaken, than that the laws of nature have been violated.* This is the marrow and strength of his essay against miracles, or supernatural facts. This sophistry has been so ably exploded by the justly celebrated Dr. George Campbell, that it would seem a work of supererogation again to notice it. But as many still rest in the delusion, who do not love truth so well as to listen to the other side of any question, for their sakes I would briefly ask Mr. Hume if he were present, or any of his friends, How do you come into the possession of that which you call universal experience? By what evidence do you acquire the assurance that the laws of nature are *inviolable?* Your own observation?! Your own senses?! A narrow horizon, truly, from which to infer the uniformity and the inviolability of the laws of nature! And is this your boasted philosophy, to infer from the evidence of your own senses, for some half century exercised on an atom of the universe—not a hand's breadth of creation—the inviolable character of its laws through infinite space and eternal duration!! A mole, a gnat, an insect may, then, from the image of this great world painted on the retina of its eye, philosophically depose that the universe is self-existent and eternal!

But, stranger still, do you call your own observations universal experience! Is not universal experience the experience of all men in all places and in all times. And have your five senses given you the assurance of the experience of all persons in all places and at all times!! It is absurd. You can know only the experience of one man in one place and at one time. The rest is all memory, or all faith. You believe the experience of all men, and know only your own. Your own experience is knowledge—other men's experience is with you faith. Yes, gentlemen, your own personal experience is all that you know of this great uni-

verse—all the rest is mere belief of the testimony of others. And so it comes to pass that Mr. Hume could not believe the testimony of *some men*, because their testimony was contrary to the testimony of *all men!!* But had he heard and examined the testimony of all men before he concluded himself in actual possession of universal experience? No—not a millionth part of the testimony of all men: and on this veriest fraction of universal experience he presumes to erect a house of refuge for all the outlaws of the universe, and calls it the Castle of Universal Experience! Mr. Hume's "splendid, unanswerable, and most philosophic argument," as his disciples call it, against supernatural facts, when analysed is simply this:—'I cannot believe the testimony of some men, because it is contrary to my own experience, and to that of a millionth part of all men, whose experience is, in my judgment, universal experience!' And so deposes the Emperor of Siam—'I cannot believe one word that an English man utters, because he says that in England men and cattle walk upon water congealed into ice, which certainly is a glaring falsehood, because contrary to my experience and to that of all the good people of the torrid zone, which is the universal experience of all mankind in all ages and in all places!'

But if it were allowable farther to expose this shameless sophistry, I would yet ask, Why does Mr. Hume believe the testimony of any man on any subject? Because his own experience and that man's exactly tally with one another? Then his own individual experience is the standard of all truth! Who can believe that? Mr. Hume, in his elegant but insidious history of England shows that he believed ten thousand facts without, or contrary to, his own experience. This, then, was mere credulity, his own philosophy being in the chair. But his vouchers were honest men, veracious and competent witnesses. And have we not as honest men—as veracious and competent witnesses of supernatural facts as they? And if we rely upon the eyes and ears of one class of witnesses, why not upon the eyes and ears of another class, who are even more disinterested and capable than they!—men who sealed their testimony of supernatural facts by laying down their lives calmly and deliberately in proof of what they alleged?

We admit that it requires good and strong and unimpeachable testimony to establish a suspension or violation of the laws of nature. And we admit that the uniformity of the laws of nature must be well established in order to the credibility of a supernatural fact: for were the laws of nature frequently suspended; or were not their uniformity, except by the interposition of the Creator, fully sustained, then the proof of a supernatural fact would be impossible. The Christian philosopher goes with all his

strength for the uniformity and inviolability of the laws of nature, unless the Author of nature interpose, and that on an occasion worthy of such an interference; for with Horace he will say—

——— Nec Deus intersit,
Nisi dignus vindice nodus.

(Let not a god appear in the piece, unless upon an occasion that calls for his presence.)

But we are persuaded, from the sciences already named, that occasions have occurred in which the Divinity has interposed: for the tables of nature, as well as the oracles of Prophets, have made it most evident: and if it were expedient for the Creator to interpose on any occasion in reference to the creation of man, Reason says, with her ten thousand tongues, more necessary it is that he interpose to save man from ruin, that this creation—this mundane system, might not issue in a perfect abortion! We Christians thank all the philosophers, and amongst them the two master spirits now before us, for their efforts to establish the uniformity and inviolability of the laws of nature: for we need their arguments to establish ours: but with one of their own school, the eloquent though visionary Rousseau, we will say, "Can God work miracles? that is to say, Can he derogate from the laws which he has established? The question, treated seriously, would be impious, if it were not absurd."

Having seen that philosophy, from all her treasures and with all her talents, not only inefficiently assails, but corroborates and illustrates the certainty of supernatural facts; we shall define a miracle with a reference to its utility in religion and morals: for with us miracles or supernatural facts are alike necessary to true morals as to true religion. Evidence and authority are demanded alike by conscience as by reason, before we make a perfect surrender of ourselves to the dictates of piety and humanity.

A MIRACLE, *in the Jewish and Christian sense, is a display of supernatural power in attestation of the truth of a message from God.* To seal a message, or to attest a messenger, is essential to the credit and acceptance of them. Now miracles are the seal of a message. "Witness my hand seal" is the philosophy of the whole matter. "God the Father *sealed* Jesus"—Moses and Jesus were *sealed* messengers of God. The former the minister of law; the latter the minister of grace: "for the law was given by Moses; but the grace and the substance came by Jesus Christ."

Now as there are two sorts of supernatural power, there are two sorts of supernatural facts—physical and mental. Miracles, then, may be displays of the one or the other, or of both conjointly, as the nature of the case may demand. The person who controls, violates, or suspends any of the laws of physical nature

—curing disease by a word, healing the sick, restoring the maimed, raising the dead, or dispossessing demons, gives evidence that he is sustained by the hand of Omnipotence. He performs physical miracles: he overpowers physical nature. This is what we mean by a display of supernatural physical power.

He who foretells a future event, depending on no known or ascertainable cause—such as the fortune of a man, a family, a nation, at any given future period, displays a mental power equally supernatural and miraculous. This is a display of supernatural mental power. Physical miracles are, then, primarily addressed to the reason and senses of living witnesses; intellectual miracles to the reason and senses of those who shall hereafter live. One class, it may be said, are primarily designed for contemporaries; the other for posterity.

Thus we who now live are made equal to those who then lived in point of assurance of the truth of the Christian religion. They saw some miracles, and believed others; we see some miracles, and believe others. The miracles which they saw, we believe; the miracles that we see, they believed. One half of our supernatural evidences grows weaker, the other half grows stronger, by time. This, with me, is a point of great moment: permit me then, gentlemen, to make myself fully understood. The power that infallibly foretells a future event, depending on no laws known to mortals, but upon a thousand contingencies beyond human calculation, is as clearly supernatural as that power which reanimates at a bidding the dust of a dead man. Not, however, the uttering of a prediction, but the accomplishment of it, constitutes the proof of omniscience.

Now the longer the interval between the prediction and the event foretold, the clearer the evidence of supernatural knowledge: whereas the longer the interval between a reported miracle, and the more numerous the hands through which it has been transmitted to us, the fainter or more obscure the evidence.—Thus, while, for the sake of argument, it might be admitted that the evidence of the miracles of Moses and of Christ, at the distance of two or four thousand years, is weaker than it was in a single century after they occurred; surely it will be conceded that their clear predictions of events two or four thousand years future, is a stronger proof of their inspiration, or divine mission, than the foretelling of events only fifty or a hundred years distant. Thus, while the evidence of physical miracles daily grows lighter, the evidence of mental miracles or prophecy daily grows heavier. And he that lives to see a prediction fully and clearly accomplished, as certainly sees a miracle as he that by his natural eyes saw Lazarus revive and leave the sepulchre at the command of Jesus of Nazareth.

To illustrate: Suppose any one should arise amongst us in the character of a divine messenger, having some communication from heaven of transcendant importance to the human race; it would not be sufficient that he solemnly affirm his mission. He must prove it: he must show the hand and seal of Heaven attached to it. Nothing like omnipotence or divine power so naturally addresses itself to the human understanding through the senses in evidence of inspiration. He performs physical miracles: this satisfies contemporaries, and they report it to posterity. But posterity would like to *see* as well as to *believe* a miracle. Well, he is as willing that posterity, as well as his contemporaries should be blessed. He, therefore, in the presence of many witnesses, at diverse times and places, foretells some future events which should in the different ages of the world sensibly and intelligibly occur: for example, among other predictions, he foretells that the inhabitants of a certain Spanish island shall, in fifty years from this time, possess this whole continent; that their language, laws, customs, and religion shall be every where predominant; and that our children, excepting such as migrate to some distant region, shall be extirpated by them. Now, suppose this prediction be made a matter of state record, placed among the archives of the nation, and copied and translated into different languages; and finally, should this event, with all its circumstances, so strange, so unexpected, so contrary to all human probability, actually occur; I ask, would not those who then lived, see as great a miracle, having the prediction in their eye, as we who saw the same Prophet raise the dead? While, then, we his contemporaries see some miracles and believe others, our posterity believe the miracles that we see, and see the miracles that we believe. And thus the more improbable the events foretold, and the longer the interval, the stronger the assurance of the mission of him that uttered them.

Such, gentlemen, are the supernatural facts recorded in the Bible, and such their *use*. And when the subject is examined with the candor and the care which its infinite importance demands, it will undoubtedly appear to all, that we who live in the year of Grace 1839, have prophecies accomplishing, miracles occurring before our eyes, which were registered in the records of nations and translated into different languages thousands of years before we were born; and therefore we have as good reason to believe that Jesus is the Saviour of the world as they who witnessed his miracles in Judea.

Indeed, the Bible is the only book in the world that ever did presume to foretell the fortune of the whole human race. It has, so to speak, one great prophetic meridian line which surrounds the destinies of our globe; and when we intelligently bring up

any particular place or epoch to that line, upon it we read its fortunes at that hour. But this requires some intelligence in that Book, and in the history of the world; it requires that both be read and understood—just as it required the Jews to walk with Jesus to the tomb of Lazarus, and to look and listen, to see and believe that miracle. It therefore behooves us to go with the Prophets, geographically and chronologically, and to listen and look that we may see and understand the miracles submitted to us. The same candor and attention that could have seen and believed a miracle then, can see and believe a miracle now.

I can illustrate by only an instance or two these remarks on the second class of miracles—those displays of supernatural intellectual power in attestation of the great proposition. I will select a single specification from each Testament. That from the Old will be found in the writings of Moses, the most ancient of historians, delivered at a time when his own people were standing around him on their way from Egypt to Canaan. In anticipation of their breaking covenant with God, the Prophet Moses states, Deut. xxviii. 46—68., certain "curses which should be upon them for a miracle and perpetual wonder." These are among the specifications:—

1. A far foreign nation, swift as eagles fly, should come from the ends of the earth—a nation of a foreign, and to them a barbarous speech—of warlike character—fierce and unrelenting to old or young—and should devour their good land with all its products—and then besiege them in all their cities.

2. The details of the sieges are then given with a minuteness that ends with a delicate lady eating her own infant secretly in the distress and straitness which should come upon them.

3. They should afterwards be reduced in number, from immense multitudes, to comparatively a very few, and driven from their own land.

4. Then they were to be scattered among all people from one end of the earth to the other, and should serve them and their gods of wood and stone.

5. And while among these nations they should have no ease, no rest for the sole of their feet; but should be seized with a trembling heart, failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind.

6. Yet they should not be absorbed by those nations; for, as saith the Lord by Jeremiah, 'they should never, while sun, moon, and stars existed, cease from being a nation before him.' Jer. xxxi. 35.

These are but a few, not a hundredth part of the clear, literal, unfigurative predictions of that miraculous people—a standing miracle, indeed, they have ever been, from the supernatural birth of Isaac to the present hour; which go to prove that Moses and

their Prophets spoke by a divine and supernatural wisdom and intelligence. Now, as they who lived in the times of the siege of Jerusalem saw the verification of so much of the prediction as pertained to that epoch, so we who now live see another portion of it literally accomplishing: we see the Jews in our own land preserved a separate and distinct people; not yet amalgamated and absorbed by any nation on earth, though dispersed through Asia, Africa, and Europe as among us, without a home, a resting place, or national institutions; yet still a people. While the Assyrians, Medo-Persians, Greeks, and Romans, who ages after the prediction was delivered tyrannized over them, and rose to the government of the world, have long since been absorbed, amalgamated, and lost in the ocean of humanity. Now that Moses wrote in Hebrew more than three thousand three hundred years ago, and was publicly and by national authority translated into Greek more than two thousand years ago, are facts as veritable and certain as that there were once Assyrians, Medes, Persians, Greeks, Romans; and that is all that is necessary to perfect this miracle. For let me ask, was it within the power of human reason or intellect to foretell, with such minuteness, with a singularity of incident unparalleled in the history of the world, the present fortunes of any people some two, three, or four thousand years ago! If this be not a display of supernatural intellectual power—a real miracle—a palpable supernatural fact, we confess ourselves incompetent judges of the attributes of any fact, ordinary or extraordinary.

Take another example:—Paul (in the 2d chapter, 2d Thess.) foretells—a man of sin, with such a variety of circumstances, as wholly transcends all human prescience, as much as the removal of a mountain exceeds all human volition. Within thirty years of the crucifixion of the Messiah he describes one who should sit in the Christian church, assuming a power over all political magistrates and rulers; that this personage could not appear till an apostacy from the Apostles' doctrine should occur, and until the Roman Pagan magistracy was taken out of the way, as a hindrance to his full revelation. He also foretells the *consumption* of this son of perdition, and final ruin, &c. And have we not this fact now before our eye? That apostacy came; Christian Emperors mounted the throne of the Cesars; and Christian priests made for themselves a *Pontifex Maximus*—a great High Priest—a Pope, who now sits in the temple of God, and who has oft assumed all the powers before described over all princes and rulers. And has not the *consumption* of his power commenced? and do we not see, ever since the Protestant Reformation, the waning and gradual diminution of his authority? Surely, we have this fact before our eyes at this moment. Now, that the

prediction is 1800 years old, is proved from the ancient Syriac and Latin versions, and all authentic records concerning the commencement and progress of Christianity, Jewish, Pagan, and Christian. And need I say, that nothing was or could be more unlikely to happen, than that the alleged vicar of one then so recently crucified, should rise to a transcendancy of power eclipsing the glory of all Roman, of all Pagan magistracy—not for a moment, but for a series of ages, amounting to almost thirteen centuries!

In the extemporaneous address of an hour, gentlemen, it is not possible to set this matter forcibly and clearly before you. We rather submit to you these facts and observations as a subject of your own examination and development. To give to one of these supernatural facts the demonstration of which it is susceptible would require more time than we have now occupied on the whole premises before us. With me, I assure you, this is a transcendant subject. True religion and true morals are, like all true science, founded on homogeneous facts. Christianity is a supernatural institution for man in a preternatural condition; and it is itself, both its proposition and its proof, a super-human system. That God should have permitted his Son to die for his rebellious creatures, in open war engaged, is itself a moral miracle, and demands supernatural attestations. It is unique. The proposition, the proof, and issue, are alike supernatural and transcendant.

In bringing this subject before you, gentlemen, I had another object: I desired to contribute my mite to the proof of another proposition not fully stated in this address—that all the discoveries in science are favorable to Christianity. The voice of nature will never contradict the voice of revelation. Nature and the Bible are both witnesses for God—they are consistent witnesses, and mutually corroborate each other. But they must be understood.

Some novices in religion are alarmed at every new discovery in science, lest it should militate against the Bible. Astronomy, geology, phrenology, have all been proscribed, like Galileo, by some untaught and unteachable ecclesiastics. We fear nothing from true science. Phrenology herself, when she takes her seat in the temple of true science, will lift up her voice for the necessity of the Bible, and of religion. She does it already by showing that man is made to worship and adore, to be both righteous and religious, just and generous; that in order to be happy, he must both know, and reverence, and delight in the true God. She proves man as he now is, to be a religious animal, and in need of a revelation from God; and leaves to reason and conscience to prefer truth to error—Christianity to idolatry—reality to fable.

That you, gentlemen, individually and collectively, may not only attain to the true science of God, but to the true enjoyment of a religion based on supernatural facts; that you may be prepared for the enjoyment of an immortal life in a new creation, is the unfeigned desire of your friend and fellow-citizen, long devoted with you to the great work of mental and moral improvement.

INCIDENTS ON A TOUR TO THE SOUTH.

NO. VI.

A FEW sincere and heavenly-minded Christians which we found in Louisiana and Mississippi, with one consent lament the sudden degeneracy of all sorts of preachers who migrate from the North. Their zeal and piety either wholly evaporate, or soon become vapid and powerless. A southern sky, or soil, or society, or something it would seem, is most prostrating to the moral constitution of preachers. They seem peculiarly susceptible of a new inspiration from the spirit of southern society. Young preachers are apt to fall in love with southern ladies; whose general amiability and numerous attractions, especially when rich, soon subdue their too susceptible hearts into the delicious allegiance of the matrimonial covenant. They are usually very zealous, and often eloquent during the days of courtship and gallantry, and seem to be greatly intent on the riches and honors that are eternal. But, alas! the fine gold of their profession soon becomes dim; and having got a rich, and beautiful, and amiable wife, the preacher is soon merged in the husband; and the participations and sympathies, and cares and fears, and hopes and joys that are conjugal absorb the affections, engross the heart, and the preacher soon finds an opiate for his conscience, and a quietus for his active benevolence, in this most apposite and consolatory text—"If a man provide not for his own, especially those of his own family, he has denied the faith and is worse than an infidel." After musing a few days on this all-important text, if he does not happen to inherit with his better half, he purchases a plantation and Negroes—becomes a planter—borrows fifty or a hundred thousand dollars, which he promises to make and pay within some four or five years; and then the days of preaching are few and far between. He is invited here, and he is invited there; but his standing excuse is, "A man must be just before he can be generous"—"I do not like to be dependent on the people: I find they are poor paymasters in things temporal. So soon as I am perfectly independent I will labor gratuitously, and do all the good in my power." He appeases his own conscience, stifles his own benevolence, and sometimes silences the complaints of the brethren by such miserable sophistry.

Perhaps a plantation and Negroes is too serious and laborious an undertaking. The law, or the counting-house, or the political arena have for him more attractions; and the preacher is now a lawyer, or a merchant, or a lawgiver. Now, whatever leniency of feeling and of

sympathy we may have for one that was called being a merchant, a lawyer, a politician, and then essays to do good as a preacher of righteousness, we cannot feel quite so much for one who has given up the winning of souls for the winning of causes, or of dollars.

But has not this young gentleman deceived the young lady whom he has thus espoused? She fell in love with him and married him as a preacher—not as a lawyer, a merchant, or a statesman? Or has she converted him from the service of Christ and the human race, to serve customers, clients, or patients? Silly woman that she is! and sillier man than she!! Of all the callings on this fair earth, that of the Christian preacher—the man of God, is sovereign and supreme.

—"I say the pulpit (in the sober use
Of its legitimate, peculiar powers)
Must stand acknowledg'd, while the world shall stand,
The most important and effectual guard,
Support, and ornament of virtue's cause.
There stands the messenger of truth: there stands
The legate of the skies!—His theme divine,
His office sacred, his credentials clear.
By him the violated law speaks out
Its thunders; and by him, in strains as sweet
As angels use, the gospel whispers peace.
He stablishes the strong, restores the weak,
Reclaims the wand'rer, binds the broken heart;
And, arm'd himself in panoply complete
Of heav'nly temper, furnishes with arms,
Bright as his own, and trains, by ev'ry rule
Of holy discipline, to glorious war,
The sacramental host of God's elect!
Are all such teachers? Would to Heav'n all were!"

I will not quarrel with the excellent poet about the word "*pulpit*," nor his "*legate* of the skies:" he may have these poetic licences. We know what he means: he means "the man of God," who for God speaks to man, and plead's for Christ's sake; or, in Christ's stead, stands forward, devoted, consecrated, and set apart to this very work, to beseech sinners to be reconciled to God. Such an officer is above all earthly comparison. He ranks only with the first class of God's ministers—the angels—the angels of the churches they surely are—the messengers of mercy—the servants of the Most High God—the ministers of the word of life—who, faithful to their Master and his cause, shall "shine like the stars for ever and ever."

And does that Christian lady say to him whom she wedded as a minister of Jesus Christ, 'My dear, I should like to see you take a higher rank in society: I should like to see my husband a Merchant; or at the Bar among the 'Squires; or in Congress among the Nobles of the land'? It is impossible! In such a case she would despise Jesus Christ himself, who chose to be a preacher of righteousness and mercy, rather than the Emperor of this world. He had the offer of this world from the Prince of this world; but, did he accept it? Did he not virtually say, 'I will *serve* the Lord my God, rather than possess all the kingdoms of the world and all the glory of them'? A Christian lady could not say to the father of her children, 'I would rather see you

a companion of the men of this world—an associate of those who neither fear God nor hope in his mercy—than enrolled among the despised and humble preachers of Christ's gospel;' for well she knows that a preacher of Christ's gospel, if indeed he be such a person, will never be a despicable, but a truly intelligent, virtuous, and honorable man—an excellent husband, and father, and friend.

I would rather suspect that she would say, 'My dear, I gave you my heart and my hand when a preacher of Christ's gospel; I loved you then, and desired to further, not to retard and destroy your usefulness in the cause in which my Saviour toiled, and wept, and bled, and died. I would rather live with you in the lonely cottage, or retired vale of life, and be partaker with you in the toils and afflictions of the Christian ministry, than to be on the throne of Queen Victoria, at the expense of silencing one of the pleaders of Christ's gospel of immortality. God forbid that I should be the cause of converting a Christian preacher into a man of this world, or even to the rank of a private citizen of Christ's kingdom! It shall never be written in the book of God's remembrance, nor shall I hear it read in the day of accounts, that when I married you, you were a burning and shining light, a useful laborer in Christ's vineyard; and I became your extinguisher! I quenched your spirit, your zeal, your devotion, and sealed your lips as a public servant of Christ! No, my dear husband, I regard not the momentary gratification of my animal nature—the taste, the fashion, the pride of this life, compared with "the things that are above"—the spiritual, unfading, eternal, and divine pleasures and honors in store for the faithful. Let me have the fortunes, good or bad, of a good and faithful minister of Christ in this world, rather than those of any other man or officer in any worldly community.'

But the southern Christians do not only complain of the young preachers for having taken to themselves wives of all whom they chose, and then abandoning partially or altogether the work of the Lord; but of another class of adventurers. The great majority of all migrating preachers, they say, are worldly adventurers—fortune-hunters, though they may not themselves so think. Most men are ignorant of themselves of the real motives of their actions: "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked; who can know it?" "Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief in departing from the living God"—"lest any of you be hardened through the *deceitfulness of sin*." "Be not deceived: God is not to be mocked," &c. We often hear a man say, 'I did not think I could have been induced to do it.' But he did it. He went to the South a preacher. In less than three years he was selling brandy and tobacco; or he was engaged as prosecuting attorney for the commonwealth—in directing writs, and issuing legal processes. Yes, Doctor Compromise has now the cure of bodies, rather than souls; and Lawyer Honesty is quoting Coke and Blackstone with as much flippancy as in days of yore he cited Paul and Peter. But now he has the collection of debts, rather than of saints; the conviction of criminals, rather than the conversion of sinners, on his docket and in his heart. Alas! alas! Lord, what is man? Man, in his best estate, is altogether vanity!

So it is, the scriptures are yet fulfilling literally before our eyes: "One has gone to his farm; another to his merchandize;" and many in

America, as well as in Asia, have, like Demas, forsaken not Paul only, but the Holy Twelve.

'I have more confidence,' said an excellent lady to me one day, 'in those natives or long residents in the Mississippi, who have within a few years dared to plead the much injured cause of the Lord's anointed. These men have long been accustomed to southern manners and customs, and having had strength to break through all these influences, we seldom see them renounce the merchandize of souls for the merchandize of cotton, and other goods and chattels.' What shall be done in such cases? Preachers say they cannot dig, and are ashamed to beg; and the people will not support them in the work. There are wrongs on both sides; but will these wrongs be plead as the foundation of right? Those brethren, however, who give themselves wholly to the work, and work all the time, say that the brethren will sustain them, and do sustain them. Men are not to expect salaries as ministers of state, who preach the gospel to the poor. Men who bask in the sunshine of courts are seldom fit for the service of the poor, nor of the Lord of the poor, who came not to be ministered unto, but to minister and lay down his life for many. We cannot expect to figure in two worlds, and be a favorite in two courts, any more than to serve two masters. One is enough. The brethren and sisters in the South authorize me to say, that if an Evangelist, able and faithful, will visit them and labor assiduously for the Lord, and keep aloof from all *speculations* in religion, trade, commerce, or matrimony, they will provide for him—and I believe it. I wish some such persons would announce to me their readiness to visit the valley of the Mississippi this fall, and I will direct their course, and endorse for their support in doing *the work of an Evangelist.* Come, brethren, the Lord's plough must not stand till you get rich in this world—till you make a fortune. 'But I am located,' says A B, 'where I cannot do much: I have a family to support, and but one talent.' Well, do not bury it in the earth, but put it to interest. Pursue no calling or business that will gag you, or seal up your lips for the Lord. It is better to live on half a loaf and win souls, than to live on double rations and build a castle on the ice. The work must be done; and you who are called by the providence of God, and by the Holy Spirit speaking to you through the Prophets and Apostles, if you do not preach the gospel and do good, I would not inherit your eternal fortune for all the States of the Union.

Thus I ruminated, soliloquized, and reasoned for eight days while ascending the Mississippi and Ohio to Louisville. I have much to reason and remonstrate with some of our preaching brethren that are now lying in dry dock, sails furled, and the worms preying upon the hull. Put to sea, brethren, or your ship will perish with the dry rot.

At Louisville, soon as I landed and got into lodgings, I was delighted to learn that the great Evangelist of that State, the beloved and much honored J. T. Johnson, sustained by that eminent servant of the Lord, brother W. Morton, were just holding a protracted meeting in the city. I had sent on an appointment for Tuesday and Wednesday, not being apprized of their meeting. We soon found each other; and really I was much refreshed and gladdened in seeing these, with brethren Gates, Elly, Bell, &c. &c.

I had the pleasure of hearing an excellent discourse from brother

Johnson in the forenoon. I spoke at night and twice on the next day. We had too many hearers to effect much. Before I arrived some ten or a dozen had been immersed; and, while there, some six or seven.—Brother J. T. Johnson continued the meeting until, in all, forty-four obeyed the gospel—a number of them gentlemen of standing; amongst whom was the President of the Louisville College. The boldness, cheerfulness, vivacity, fluency, and perseverance of brother Johnson eminently qualify him for great usefulness. I wish Kentucky had a few persons equally gifted for taking care of the sheep, as brother Johnson is for marking them and putting them into the green pastures.

A. C.

THE MORMON BIBLE.

The Boston Recorder of last week contains the following singular development of the origin and history of the Mormon Bible. It accounts most satisfactorily for the existence of the book, a fact which heretofore it has been difficult to explain. It was difficult to imagine how a work containing so many indications of being the production of a cultivated mind, should be connected with a knavery so impudent and a superstition so gross as that which must have characterized the founders of this pretended religious sect. The present narrative, which, independently of the attestations annexed, appears to be by no means improbable, was procured from the writer by the Rev. Mr. Stow, of Holliston, who remarks that he has "had occasion to come in contact with Mormonism in its grossest forms." It was communicated by him for publication in the Recorder. *Boston Daily Advertiser.*

ORIGIN OF THE "BOOK OF MORMON," OR "GOLDEN BIBLE."

As this book has excited much attention, and has been put, by a certain new sect, in the place of the sacred scriptures, I deem it a duty which I owe to the public to state what I know touching its origin. That its claims to a divine origin are wholly unfounded, needs no proof to a mind unperverted by the grossest delusions. That any sane person should rank it higher than any other merely human composition, is a matter of the greatest astonishment; yet it is received as divine by some who dwell in enlightened New England, and even by those who have sustained the character of devoted Christians. Learning recently that Mormonism has found its way into a church in Massachusetts, and has impregnated some of its members with its gross delusions, so that excommunication has become necessary, I am determined to delay no longer doing what I can to strip the mask from this monster of sin, and to lay open this pit of abominations.

Rev. Solomon Spaulding, to whom I was united in marriage in early life, was a graduate of Dartmouth College, and was distinguished for a lively imagination and a great fondness for history. At the time of our marriage he resided in Cherry Valley, New York. From this place we removed to New Salem, Ashtabula county, Ohio; sometimes called Conneaut, as it is situated upon Conneaut creek. Shortly after our removal to this place his health sunk, and he was laid aside from

active labors. In the town of New Salem there are numerous mounds and forts, supposed by many to be the dilapidated dwellings and fortifications of a race now extinct. These ancient relics arrest the attention of the new settlers and become objects of research for the curious. Numerous implements were found and other articles, evincing great skill in the arts. Mr. Spaulding being an educated man, and passionately fond of history, took a lively interest in these developments of antiquity; and in order to beguile the hours of retirement, and furnish employment for his lively imagination, he conceived the idea of giving *a historical sketch of this long lost race.* Their extreme antiquity of course would lead him to write in *the most ancient style*, and as the Old Testament is the most ancient book in the world, he imitated its style as nearly as possible. His sole object in writing this *historical romance* was to amuse himself and his neighbors. This was about the year 1812. Hull's surrender at Detroit occurred near the same time, and I recollect the date well from that circumstance. As he progressed in his narrative, the neighbors would come in from time to time to hear portions read, and a great interest in the work was excited among them. It claimed to have been written by *one of the lost nation*, and to have been *recovered from the earth*, and assumed the title of "Manuscript Found." The neighbors would often inquire how Mr. S. progressed in deciphering "the manuscript," and when he had a sufficient portion prepared he would inform them, and they would assemble to hear it read. He was enabled, from his acquaintance with the classics and ancient history, to introduce *many singular names*, which were particularly noticed by the people, and could be easily recognized by them. Mr. Solomon Spaulding had a brother, Mr. John Spaulding, residing in the place at the time, who was perfectly familiar with this work, and repeatedly heard the whole of it read.

From New Salem we removed to Pittsburg, Pennsylvania. Here Mr. S. found an acquaintance and friend in the person of Mr. Patterson, an editor of a newspaper. He exhibited his manuscript to Mr. P., who was very much pleased with it, and borrowed it for perusal. He retained it a long time, and informed Mr. S. that if he would make out a title-page and preface, he would publish it, and it might be a source of profit. This Mr. S. refused to do, for reasons which I cannot now state. Sidney Rigdon,* who has figured so largely in the history of the Mormons, was at this time connected with the printing office of Mr. Patterson, as is well known in that region, and as Rigdon himself has frequently stated. Here he had ample opportunity to become acquainted with Mr. Spaulding's manuscript, and to copy it if he chose. It was a matter of notoriety and interest to all who were connected with the printing establishment. At length the manuscript was returned to its author, and soon after we removed to Amity, Washington county, Pa., where Mr. S. deceased in 1816. The manuscript then fell into my hands and was carefully preserved. It has frequently been examined by my daughter, Mrs. M'Kenstry, of Monson, Massachusetts, with whom I now reside, and by other friends. After the "Book of Mormon" came out, a copy of it was taken to New Salem, the place of Mr. Spaulding's former residence, and the very place where the "Manuscript Found" was written. A woman-preacher appointed a meeting there,

* One of the leaders and founders of the sect.

and, in the meeting, read and repeated copious extracts from the "Book of Mormon." The historical part was immediately recognized by all the older inhabitants as the identical work of Mr. Spaulding, in which they had been so deeply interested years before. Mr. John Spaulding was present, who is an eminently pious man, and *recognized perfectly* the work of his brother. He was amazed and afflicted that it should have been perverted to so wicked a purpose. His grief found vent in a flood of tears; and he arose on the spot, and expressed in the meeting his deep sorrow and regret that the writings of his sainted brother should be used for a purpose so vile and shocking. The excitement in New Salem became so great that the inhabitants had a meeting, and deputed Dr. Philastus Hurlbut, one of their number, to repair to this place and to obtain from me the original manuscript of Mr. Spaulding, for the purpose of comparing it with the Mormon Bible, to satisfy their own minds, and to prevent their friends from embracing an error so delusive. This was in the year 1834. Dr. Hurlbut brought with him an introduction and request for the manuscript, signed by Messrs. Henry Lake, Aaron Wright, and others, with all whom I was acquainted, as they were my neighbors when I resided in New Salem.

I am sure that nothing could grieve my husband more, were he living, than the use which has been made of his work. The air of antiquity which was thrown about the composition doubtless suggested the idea of converting it to purposes of delusion. Thus a historical romance, with the addition of a few pious expressions and extracts from the sacred scriptures, has been construed into a new Bible, and palmed off upon a company of poor deluded fanatics as divine. I have given the previous brief narration, that this work of deep deception and wickedness may be searched to the foundation, and its author exposed to the contempt and execration he so justly deserves.

MATILDA DAVISON.

Rev. Solomon Spaulding was the first husband of the narrator of the above history. Since his decease she has been married to a second husband, by the name of Davison. She is now residing in this place; is a woman of irreproachable character, and an humble Christian, and her testimony is worthy of implicit confidence.

A. ELY, D. D., Pastor Cong. Church in Monson.
D. R. AUSTIN, Principal of Monson Academy.

Monson, (Mass.) April 1, 1839.

SINCE reading "*Mormonism Unveiled*" we have had but little doubt that Sidney Rigdon is the leading conjuror in this diabolical affair; and that the widow of Solomon Spaulding, if found, could give some authentic and satisfactory information on the subject of the Book of Mormon—so far at least as the romance of Mr. Spaulding, the real basis of the fraud, was concerned. It would seem that she has been found in the wife of a second husband, Mrs. Davison, and that the whole affair is now at length fairly divulged. Much pains ought to be taken to send this document through the length and breadth of the land—as the emissaries of Smith, Rigdon, and Co., like the father of lies, are ever on the

alert to beguile unstable souls, and continually lying in wait to deceive. The gullability of the present generation has not, in the memory of history, been often equalled—never surpassed. A people ignorant of the Bible are always an easy prey to the ministers of delusion and error.

A. C

SIN—*A DIALOGUE.*

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 153.]

Eugenio. Is it possible for us to discover the *origin* of this desolating evil? Or is it, indeed, permitted to us to make such an inquiry? The human mind, like Noah's dove, seeks a resting place. Must it always, in relation to this subject, return disappointed from a shoreless ocean of uncertainty to the point from which it set out?

Philander. By no means. It will in due season find a place of rest, if, like the dove, it is content to seek it upon *earth;* and does not, from a vain ambition, lose itself amidst the clouds.

Eugenio. The inquiries which present themselves to me respecting the origin of sin are these:—Where did it originate? When? How? and Why? In what way, then, would you reply to such queries?

Philander. It would be necessary first to understand distinctly their bearing and application. Do they apply to sin in the abstract, or the concrete?—absolutely, or relatively? Sin, as we have it defined, is the transgression of law. Is it then asked, Where, when, how, and why law was first transgressed? Let us first endeavor to ascertain, if we can, where, when, how, and why law was first given. Or, seeing that different classes of beings have transgressed law, to which of them do these inquiries relate? To men? or to the angels who kept not their first estate? If to the former, we may find an answer by a recourse to the history of men: if to the latter, the querist can only be referred for a solution to the angels who are doubtless best acquainted with their own records. To men belong the things of men: to angels, the things of angels. To institute inquiries into matters which do not concern us, is to indulge a vain and unprofitable curiosity. And as there is no vice to which men are more addicted than this, there is no stronger internal evidence of the divine origin of the holy scriptures, than that they reveal nothing which is not directly or indirectly useful to men and necessary to be known, and that all unprofitable questions are therein inhibited as ignorant and foolish. He, then, who would pry into the secret councils of the palace of the universe, if he dislike not the reveries of Swedenborg, may love the visions of Mahomet, and

discover, if he can, whether, with respect to angels, sin originated in the first, second, or third heaven. As for us, with the Bible in our hands, we can only say, that, as respects the human family, sin originated in the garden of Eden. There law was first given to man, and there it was first transgressed.

Eugenio. But do not the scriptures themselves reveal to us something respecting sin as existing antecedently among the angelic host?

Philander. They reveal nothing more in relation to its previous existence than is barely necessary to the narrative of its introduction into Eden. The scenes to which it has given rise upon earth seem to constitute but an interlude, or an underplot in the great drama which is enacted upon the theatre of the universe, and as men are connected with angels in this matter, enough is said to show that connexion, and no more. As to angels themselves, it is not revealed to us where it originated, nor when. With regard to ourselves, we are fully informed that it originated, as before stated, in Eden, and in the days of our first parents.

Eugenio. For an account of the way in which it was introduced into Eden, you will then doubtless refer the querist to the third chapter of Genesis.

Philander. Exactly so. He will there find that the serpent, called elsewhere the devil, and the adversary,* is represented as tempting our first mother and inducing her by falsehood and deceit to eat of the forbidden tree; of which, through her persuasions, her husband became then a partaker. I say, persuasions; for as Adam was not compelled to partake with her, and the scripture assures us he was not deceived, he must have been persuaded. To us, then, this apostate angel who appears upon the stage as the adversary of the Most High, is the author and originator of sin. He is the father of it.

Eugenio. May we carry out the figure, and say that to us sin has also a mother?

Philander. Assuredly. That mother is denominated Lust—for says the scripture, "When Lust hath conceived it bringeth forth Sin." The term "lust" is here, and indeed commonly in the scriptures, used in a general sense as signifying *inordinate desire.* We have, as we were before saying, desires which are lawful, natural, and necessary in our present condition. But these must be restrained within the limits assigned by Nature and by Nature's God, lest, like the swollen river or the raging ocean, they pass beyond the proper boundaries, and become injurious rather than beneficial. Whenever desire passes the limits prescribed by law, it constitutes lust. Sin is the transgression of law—

* Rev. xx. 2.

Now as men act from motive, they will love inordinately, or lust after, something forbidden by the law, before they will break the law to obtain it. Hence lust always precedes sin and gives birth, as it were, to it.—And hence the Apostles represent the "corruptions that are in the world" as occasioned by "lust," and all the evils that exist as springing from "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life."

Eugenio. Lust, then, has respect to the degree or intensity of desire for any object that may gratify the senses or the pride of man, rather than to the kind or nature of the desire itself.

Philander. To desire in any degree whatever that which is prohibited by law, is to lust. So it is equally to indulge an excessive passion for objects in themselves lawful, when law has fixed the proper boundaries of desire. As lust is desire going beyond law, it is law alone which can define it. It is much more common, however, for men to lust for that which they ought only to love, than to desire what is unnatural and entirely forbidden.

Eugenio. It is so; for indeed we have at present few, if any, prohibitions purely arbitrary. The laws we have are assigned to direct and control the passions and affections. And this brings us again to the point which we considered a little ago; to wit, that the laws prescribed to us by nature and by revelation are in perfect harmony with each other, and have for their objects our preservation and happiness.

Philander. There is nothing more true or more worthy of attention than this. To yield to lust is indeed to enjoy a transient pleasure—the pleasure of sin; but it is the nature of this irregular and tumultuous passion to destroy the very objects of desire, and thus put an end both to present happiness and the hope of the future. Were I to personify love, by which I mean lawful desire, and lust in the view just given, I should represent the former as the happy man, of whose choice Cowley says, that

> "His life he to his doctrine brought,
> And in a garden's shade that sovereign pleasure sought.
> Whoever a true Epicure would be,
> May there find cheap and virtuous luxury."

He plucks from the bending bough the golden fruit, and temperately enjoys it from day to day with grateful relish. But lust, I would say, is the Louisiana savage, cutting down the tree that he may gorge himself to the full, while he destroys the source of his enjoyment. Or, I would depict love as the naturalist gazing with devout admiration upon a gaudy butterfly as he leisurely expands his wings, spotted with azure green and gold, as though he would contrast them with the whiteness of the lily on which he rests; but lust as the school-boy seizing

the beautiful insect with rude and eager hands, and brushing away all its beauty in seeking to retain it in his grasp.

Eugenio. I appreciate the truth of your remark, and the aptness of your illustration. Yet to what you have said, that although there is a pleasure in sin it destroys the source of its own pleasure, I would add that it is really attended also with pain. For as you formerly observed, it is not possible for any one to transgress the laws established for our happiness by infinite wisdom and goodness, without suffering pain as the penalty of that infraction. In this view I would, if you permit me, illustrate my meaning by representing love as a beautiful maiden gently approaching a bed of roses, delighting in their beauty and charmed with their sweet fragrance as it is borne upon the breeze; and lust, on the other hand, as the thoughtless urchin seizing the beautiful flower with eagerness, and not only destroying its beauty, but piercing his hand with its thorns. Or, I would compare love to the sage enjoying the brilliancy of the lamp which gives light to all who are in the house; and lust to the winged moth of the summer's evening, burning himself in the flame he loved too well.

Philander. Your remark is just. And how accordant then with reason and benevolence are those kind admonitions and teachings contained in the holy scriptures in reference to the government of the passions, and the proper direction of the faculties of man! Alas! how greatly have these swerved from the true equilibrium since the nicely adjusted balance was first disturbed in Eden. And how perfectly does the history of the temptation in the 3d chapter of Genesis quadrate with the views presented by the Apostles respecting the nature and tendency of inordinate desire! For it is obvious from the account there given, that it was lust—the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the lust of god-like knowledge—an ambitious pride which overcame the constancy of our first mother, and became to her and to the whole human race the mother of sin and death. "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired [lusted after] to make one wise, she took of the fruit," &c. How simple and excellent an exposition is given in this brief account of the true and unchanging motives which lead to the transgression of law!

Eugenio. It clearly developes both the principles to which sin owes its birth, and the agency by which they were first brought into action. It seems to me that the proud sceptic, who does not think the less of himself that he cannot tell who was his great great grandfather, ought to be satisfied with a genealogy of sin which traces its lineage for near six thousand years to the birth-place of the human family.

R. R.

SHORT SERMONS ON CHRISTIAN PRACTICE.

SERMONS ON PRAYER—*No. II.*

"I exhort first of all,—that deprecations, supplications, intercessions, and thanksgivings be made for all men—for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead quiet and peaceable lives, in all godliness and honesty: for this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have all men to be saved, and to come to an acknowledgment of the truth."—1 Tim. ii. 1.

Men, Brethren, and Fathers,

We are not among those who believe that when Paul commanded Christians to "teach and admonish one another in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs," he meant hymns—and hymns—and hymns. Nor can we be persuaded that when he exhorts that supplications, prayers, intercessions and thanksgivings be made for all men, he meant only one thing, four times stated. Paul had neither time nor taste for such tautology.

Any address to God expressive of our desires may be generically called prayer. But here are specific duties denominated deprecation, prayer, intercession, and thanksgiving. In this apostolic classification Christians in their prayers are to attend to four distinct items:—They are to deprecate evils; supplicate favors; intercede for persons; and return thanks for benefits received. Yes, they may *deprecate* all sorts of evils—"Deliver us from evil"—"Abandon us not to temptation:" *supplicate* all sorts of favors, temporal and spiritual—"Give us this day our daily bread"—"Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors:" they are to *intercede* for all sorts of persons, as did Abraham—"Peradventure there be ten righteous in the city, wilt thou also destroy and not spare the place—the city and its inhabitants—for ten's sake?" "And the Lord said, I will not destroy the city for ten's sake." And said Jesus, "Into whatever house you enter, say, *Peace be to this house;*" for so prayed he for others—"I pray for all them that shall believe on me through their word—that they all may be one—that the world may believe that thou hast sent me"—"Forgive them, for they know not what they do," &c. And finally, we are in every thing to *give thanks*, and for all sorts of favors conferred on ourselves and others.*

Two questions, my beloved friends, arise here:—For whom and for what are Christians to pray? For method's sake, and for your memory's sake, I will formally ask, and answer these two questions:—

1st. For *whom* are Christians to pray?

Paul shall answer. He has answered in our text—"*For all men.*" But says the Universalist, "It is not for the salvation of all men: for all men are decreed to be saved." One, then, may as consistently

* We are not so whimsically critical, nor so mathematically precise, as to imagine that in the order of the words these things must be so arranged as that we must always begin with *deprecations* and end with *thanksgivings*, else our worship is inacceptable. We do not thus convert the New Testament into a *ritual* or *rubrick*, as one of our very precise brethren in the West, who will, in despite of all remonstrance, have it that the *order of words* in Acts ii. 42. is the divinely stereotyped *order of Christian worship;* who, to prove that in narration that which is first told always first happened, actually proved that Noah's oldest son Japheth was the youngest, because he is always last mentioned. Thus refuting himself without knowing it!

pray for the sun to rise to-morrow morning, as to pray for the ultimate salvation of all men; because both events are foreordained from all eternity. Again, says the ultra-Calvinist, 'The Christian cannot pray for all men; for the elect are so definite and so fixed, that their number can neither be increased nor diminished. It is for all *sorts* of men—for kings, and all in authority,' says he, 'and not for all individual men. The praying for *sorts* of men, rather than men, is a doctrine of the schools, and not of Christ. But can we pray for a sort or class of men without praying for the men that compose it? It is preposterous. Could an Englishman pray for kings and for all in authority in that great empire, without praying for the *persons* of those kings and public functionaries of authority? It is absurd. To pray for all sorts of men is to pray for all men in all these classes, or it is downright mummery and mockery.'

Paul assigns two reasons for these universal prayers. Perhaps we may learn something from considering them. The reason assigned for praying for kings and officers is, that Christians under their government be allowed to lead quiet and peaceable lives, in all godliness and honesty. For their own good, then, they are to pray for the governments under which they live; for this will not only propitiate the governors to their interests, but the Lord sustaining and blessing the governors with prosperity, it will secure like favors to them. Thus preached Jeremiah to the captive Jews—"Seek the good of the city whither the Lord has caused you to be carried away captive: for in the peace thereof shall you have peace." But the second reason rises beyond their own interest: for adds the Apostle, This is moreover "good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour, who will have *all men to be saved*," and to come to an acknowledgment of the gospel, or of *the truth*. It is, then, in harmony with the divine will. It is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour to pray for all men; and surely this is the best reason in the world that can be given for doing any thing! This point decided, we next ask—

2d. For *what* are Christians to pray?

We answer first in very general terms:—As we may pray for all persons whom we love, so we may pray for all things that we desire—according to the will of God. Whom may we love? According to the will of God, I ask, whom may we love? I answer, *All* men, friends and foes. Bless your friends; "bless your enemies;" "pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you;" not for that class, but for the very individuals that compose it. Pray for all men. Love and desire are, then, the metes and boundaries of prayer; and this love and desire are only to be limited by the revealed will of God. All *persons* may be loved—all *good things* may be desired. For both, then, it is lawful to pray.

But both the power of prayer and the objects and uses of prayer will be better seen and more highly appreciated by an induction of instances from the Bible:—Abraham prayed for the king of Egypt, and he was cured. He prayed for a son, and Isaac was born. Isaac and Rebecca had no issue; he entreated the Lord, and Jacob and Esau were the answer to his prayer. Jacob prayed for Joseph, and he inherited blessings above the blessings of his progenitors. Jacob wrestled with the Lord and prevailed, and obtained the title "Israel"—*a Prince of God*,

Moses interceded for Aaron, and his life was saved: he lifted up his hands to heaven, and Israel triumphed over Amalek. Hannah prayed for a son, and Samuel was the son that was given. Samuel prayed against the enemies of Israel, and the Lord answered him by thundering upon them from heaven; and again he prayed, and the Lord answered him by thunder for a sign to Israel. How oft did David say, "I sought the Lord, and he heard me and delivered me from all my fears" —"In my distress I called upon the Lord, and cried unto my God: he heard my voice out of his temple, and my cry came before him, even into his ears"—"Thou heardest the voice of my deprecations when I cried to thee"—"I love the Lord, because he has heard my voice and my supplications; because he has inclined his ear unto me: therefore will I call upon him so long as I live." Hezekiah, seized with a deadly distemper, prayed earnestly to the Lord, and the Lord said, "I have heard thy prayer, and have seen thy tears, and I have added unto thy days fifteen years." Again, he prayed to be saved from the Assyrian hosts under Sennacherib their king, and in one night the angel of death slew one hundred and eighty-five thousand men! And what shall I more say? The time would fail me to tell of Elijah, who shut and opened heaven by prayer; of Zacharias and Elizabeth, whose prayers obtained another Elijah; of the multitudes of Jews who sought and obtained many cures and blessings from the Messiah; of Cornelius, whose prayer brought an angel from heaven, and Peter from Joppa to communicate to him the word of eternal life; of the prayers of the primitive church, that shook both heaven and earth—that brought Peter out of the inner prison at the hour of midnight, and made the word of the Lord run speedily throughout the earth. All sorts of blessings, temporal, spiritual, and eternal, have been vouchsafed to men and women in answer to prayer.

Wherever there is much faith there will be much prayer; and little faith, little prayer. The Lord is very liberal; but he desires for our good that we should ask, seek, and knock, not only once, twice, or three times, but often, very often; for he that thus seeks, finds; and to him who thus knocks, it shall be opened.

Having, then, answered these two important questions—For whom we ought to pray, and for what—we shall notice an objection sometimes offered against the obvious meaning of these words, "*Who will have all men to be saved.*" An objector says, 'Is not God omnipotent, and can he not do what he wills? If, then, he wills the salvation of all, must not all be saved?' God, indeed, is omnipotent; but wisdom and goodness direct his power. He can only do what his goodness prompts and his wisdom directs. Power, then, only executes what wisdom directs and goodness prompts. Now goodness prompts to save the willing, and not the unwilling; and wisdom guides how this may be done compatibly with the promptings of divine goodness: therefore, God cannot save the unwilling, though he desires not the death of the sinner, but rather that he would turn and live; for, as Peter says, "he desires not that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." God is, then, omnipotent to save all that come to him by his Son; but he cannot save those who will not have his Son to reign over them.

Brethren, pray for every one you love, and for every thing you law-

fully desire. A Christian should not desire any thing for which he ought not to pray; and he ought to pray to the Lord for every thing he rationally desires, even to the minuteness of his daily bread. Be anxious, then, for nothing; but in every thing, by prayer and deprecation, let your requests be made known to God. A. C.

MORALITY OF CHRISTIANS—*No. XIV.*

The whole law of religion and of morality is found in the word love. The two great precepts on which, according to the Infallible Commentator himself, the whole Law and all the Prophets hang, are, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and soul, and mind, and strength, and thy neighbor as thyself." Love to man is, then, the fulfilling of the whole law of morals. Love, indeed, works no ill to one's neighbor: hence we never read of a man's stealing from his neighbor, slandering his reputation, falsifying his own promises to him, or injuring his person—because, he *loved* him.

The shortest and most effectual way to cultivate all moral excellence is to cultivate love. Our morality towards all men will ever be found to keep pace with our love to all men. Every man acts morally towards every man whom he loves as a Christian ought to love his neighbor; and more or less immorally towards those with whom he associates whom he does not so love.

Hatred, or a morbid and an accursed selfishness, which seeks its own at the expense of others, or more than its own by intrenchments upon the rights of others, is the deep and vigorous root of all the immoralities of man to man. He that only hates his brother, is, in the morality of the Apostle John, a murderer. Hatred necessarily works always in that direction, and naturally terminates in that point.

The cultivation of good feelings towards all mankind is, therefore, the daily business of the practical Christian moralist. To do this with effect, he must place himself on more eminences than those upon which Balak placed Balaam whom he hired to curse Israel. From each of those lofty points he must look upon the human race, in a single point of view, as the children of one father and mother—as having been universally and equally involved in one great misfortune by one common enemy—as having been consequently doomed to a series of calamities, ultimately terminating in the loss of this present life—as having been respited from instant ruin by the interposition of a great Mediator, and placed under one and the same remedial system—as being equally embraced in the philanthropy of one God and of one Redeemer—as destined to one and the same glorious new creation, if

obedient to the divinely ordained Commander and Chief, the Lord Jesus Christ—as having, in the meantime, equally to strive against the corruptions of a common fallen and degenerate nature—and as having the same great and precious promises to assist them in this bold and glorious enterprize of laying hold on eternal life, &c. &c. He that will ponder often, and ponder long and deeply on such points as these, will rather mourn and weep over the misfortunes of men, than snarl like a cynic or laugh like a comedian at them. There is incomparably more in the history and present circumstances of man to excite our sympathies, our sorrows, and our benevolent efforts, than our derision or our malevolence.

The pulpit and the press ought not only to inculcate, but pre-eminently to exhibit the graces and excellencies of this divine morality. Those who fill these lofty and responsible stations in society ought to be most exemplary in these virtues—not merely in admiring them, or recommending them to others, but in the practice of them. And yet, with ineffable mortification, we see these often prostituted into theatres of defamation, misrepresentation, and abuse. That which may, and ought to be eminently useful and beneficial to mankind, may also be greatly and eminently injurious when perverted. The pulpit and the press, when they are not potent in good, are always potent in evil. hey afford great facilities in doing mischief, and in deteriorating society, as well as in improving it. There are many presses that are a moral pestilence to society—that pour forth floods of infidelity, irreligion, profanity, and licentiousness upon the community that sustains them. The pulpit, as well as the theatre, is often a real nuisance to those who appear before it.

There are many ways of killing a man besides shooting him—of poisoning him without the use of arsenic. There are many ways of vitiating the taste and the morals of people besides dramatic representations, and obscene pictures. To caricature virtue and palliate vice—to commend false principles of action, and to malign the true and the genuine, whether from the pulpit or the press, are, to say the least, as deleterious and fatal to society as the circus, the theatre, or the ball-room of the moderns, or the amphitheatres and gladiatory exhibitions of the ancients. We are often barking at one vice and fawning upon another at the same time, because of the livery they wear. We praise what comes from the pulpit, and censure what comes from the stage, as if the plank and the paintings, rather than the sentiment, the spirit, and the tendency of what is uttered, were subjects of approbation or reprobation.

While I sincerely opine that the stage has ruined many, and never done good to any person, I am still more persuaded that the pulpit has

been more fatal to the souls of multitudes than the stage; and not only because of its false doctrines and paralogy, but because of its positive impiety and immorality.

Protestants will concur with me in opinion as to the mummery, mockery, and trickery of the old "Mother Church," while, as dutiful daughters, they have only more fashionably appareled themselves in the same garb and trumpery, cut and trimmed after a less offensive model. Hypocrisy, insincerity, irreverence, licentiousness, antinomianism, and even profanity, often show themselves through all the dress and trimmings of the sanctimoniousness in which even modern orthodoxy occasionally decorates herself

The profanity of the religious press is sanctioned and often encouraged by the licentiousness of the pulpit. By the profanity of the religious press, I do not mean that gross and vulgar thing sometimes designated profanity. But I hold it to be profane to give us a grave lecture on the "new birth" in one column of a religious newspaper, as I have just now seen, and on the next to give us a treatise on "eggs and poultry." This is to place regeneration and eggs on common ground; and this necessarily desecrates the one or consecrates the other.

I never liked to see professors talking politics or economics till the moment of dinner, and in an instant of time, almost in the same breath, invoke the Most High in thanksgiving for the repast provided; while as yet the echo of the name of some traduced or extolled political demagogue was ringing in the ears of the company. This is too much like introducing balls with prayers, or singing psalms in a play-house between the comedy and the farce. Cattle shows have, within my knowledge, been preceded with a visit to the sanctuary and a long prayer, while the Durham cows were bellowing for their calves, and the brood mares neighing for their colts hard by the synagogue. This differs not much from the piety that feasts on Scott and Bulwer till the bell rings for family worship, which closes the romance and opens the *psalter* at the striking of the clock. All this, with me, is real profanity, though more polished and fashionable than that which we hear in the streets, or see in the haunts of licentiousness and crime.

Custom has consecrated a great deal of impiety and immorality both in the pulpit and the religious press; and society is polluted and vitiated in the very sanctuary of religion by her professed friends and advocates. In elevating the standard of morality among Christians I find it impossible to gain ground unless the public taste is enlightened and improved on the present character and standing both of the pulpit and the religious press—to which it has become necessary that we should occasionally devote an essay or two. A. C.

SCHOOLS AND EDUCATION—*NO. II.*

Of the four schools essential to the proper training and development of man, the FAMILY SCHOOL is first in order, as it is first in importance. Man is formed and moulded in the domestic circle more than in all the other circles in the world. We all acknowledge this, and therefore it needs no proof. But how shall he be best trained in this school? He has to learn things and persons, and the differences and relations between them. But his own relations to persons and things are a most prominent and indispensable item. His natural relations first—his moral relations next. These, as well as the art of reading, should be learnt at home. The judicious mother will seldom commit this honor to others; she will always, if in her power, have this delightful task performed under her own inspection, if not by her own lips. Aware that precept is little, and example every thing with a child, she will rely infinitely more upon how she speaks, what she speaks, and what she does in the presence of her child, than upon what she may command it to do.

1st. She will teach it early rising, personal cleanliness, self-government, filial reverence and affection, brotherly kindness and love. Until it can read the Bible for itself, she will imbue its mind with the truths and sentiments and inspirations of that book, by teaching it in the most simple style, its stupendous facts, its holy precepts, and its rich and precious promises.

2d. She will also, on every suitable occasion, teach it its own frame and the physical laws of its being; the conditions of life, of health and physical happiness; and as far as its age can apprehend these, she will diligently seek to make it acquainted with itself.

3d. The use of itself in the creation—the use of its body and of its mind in the sphere of its being will also constitute a continual lesson in the early communications of discreet and well educated parents. Industry, energy, activity, economy, will be taught as carefully as the alphabet, both theoretically and practically. The employment of the hand, as well as that of the mind, is a most essential department of education, and should form a necessary part of the training of the son of a king as well as of the son of his humblest subject.

Every one that has a hand is as much obliged to use it as his mind; nay, indeed, he cannot manage the one without the other. The mind is essential to the proper use of the hand, and the exercise of the hand is indispensable to the full development of the mind. Every sane parent will eschew the doctrine that industry is a disgrace; and that his son's hands were not made to handle the quill, the chisel, the axe, the spade, or the plough. To train a child to consume the labors of others, without equivalent services rendered to them, is the shortest and surest way to teach it dishonesty and great immorality at one lesson. No human being can be trained morally and religiously who is not trained to habitual industry. The art of reading is not more essential to a scholar, than the art of industry is to a good citizen or a good Christian.

The family school, guided and managed by wise and affectionate parents, will not neglect any one of the items of education just now

mentioned, any more than it will neglect to feed and clothe its infant members. But it will be said, few parents, from their defective education, are qualified to discharge judiciously and faithfully these duties. It must, indeed, be conceded that those parents who have not themselves been well educated, can seldom ably discharge those duties to their own households. Hence the necessity of immediate reformation in family education, lest the difficulties that now prevent the adoption of a rational and moral system should be continued and prolonged to the great detriment of the best interests of the human race.*

The time has come when a thorough reformation in education must be generally adopted—and especially in this school now under consideration. One item of that reformation, for which we will always contend, is, that religious and moral culture must be first, last, midst, and without end, in every school in which man is moulded for the high ends of his destiny. Every fact, incident, event—every system—sidereal, solar, lunar, mundane—every ocean, sea, lake, river, fountain—every mountain, hill, valley, plain—every organized creature—tree, shrub, flower—bird, beast, fish, insect, and atom of the universe, must be noticed, developed, taught in reference to God and Christ and immortality.

We care not what Deists, Sceptics, Atheists, Sectarians may say: the Bible facts, narratives, precepts, promises, revelations, must be the standing text in every intelligent, moral, polite, and well-bred family on earth, from the royal palace down to the shepherd's tent. Religion, morality, politeness—or, in one word, happiness, individual and social, must be the standing order of the day—of every day, in every model family, from the highest to the lowest in the land, before the Christian dispensation shall have attained its millennial glory in this world.

Nature and history, or creation and providence, may—nay, must be studied; but they must be studied in relation to the God of nature, of providence, and of redemption. They must be an essential part of the course in any school, and in every school which we wish to institute or patronize; and, chief of all, in the infant or family school. The order of such a well regulated family or school is yet almost universally to be learned, so far as my knowledge extends. In such a family religion will be the business of the day—not a form, or ceremony, or duty to be performed after supper, before going to bed, when all are drowsy or asleep; nor before breakfast, when all are preparing for the business of the day. In the morning one hour's reading the scripture by the whole family, in turn, with questions and explanations adapted to the understanding and improvement of all, will be of more value than months of such devotions as are usually called family worship, performed according to the prevailing customs of this age. But an hour in the morning and another in the evening so spent, would be too little for the biblical portion of the education of a family of ordinary size. Experience and the testimony of others who have tried it, amply support this conclusion.

But say many, 'We have not time so to instruct our children and to improve our own knowledge and piety.' Astonishing! For what, then,

* In the development of the system of education which we are about to recommend and desire to institute, this difficulty will be more minutely discussed.

was time given! You have nothing so deserving of time as this matter. To hear one say he has not time to save himself and family from ignorance, guilt, and bondage, by a due attention upon the appointed means, reminds one of the lady who had not time to pull her child out of the fire till she had finished the ornaments she was preparing for its person. It is most absurd! This is the first of all claims upon time, and indeed the only portions of redeemed time, which will be always remembered with inexpressible joy, are those hours devoted to the religious and moral culture of ourselves, our children, and domestics. Without this school no system will ever meet the expectations of the world, the predictions of the Prophets, or qualify human beings for the high destiny, spiritual and eternal, which awaits them who walk in the paths of wisdom and virtue. A. C.

FISHER THE REVIVALIST.

MANY of our readers have doubtless heard of Mr. *Fisher*, the celebrated Baptist revivalist, who has even surpassed his master, Mr. Maffit, some Baptists being judges, in his declamatory eloquence and power of fascination. They will also remember that in September last I was asked by a brother Robinson, of Madison, Indiana, whether this Mr. Fisher had not been excluded from one of our churches for unchristian conduct; Mr. Fisher having, from the "sacred desk," in that town, denied that he ever was connected with any of our churches, "by letter, baptism, experience, or *any other way*." In the face of this public denial, when called upon, I feel it my duty to sustain the veracity of brother Robinson, and to declare the fact that the said Fisher "*was once reckoned a brother among the disciples, and was a member of a church near Middletown, Pa., from which he was excluded for disorderly and unchristian behaviour.*" For this testimony I am spoken of in the following terms, by *John L. Waller*, the Editor of the "Baptist Banner," Ky., Dec. 27, 1838:—

"MR. CAMPBELL NAILED TO THE WALL.—We have several times alluded to Mr. Campbell's base slander upon the character of brother Fisher in the 9th number of the 2d volume of the Millennial Harbinger. We now insert his remarks that our readers may see with what reckless composure he can make most hellish meals of good men's names' 'The safety of community demands that such a man should be avoided as a pestilence. His breath is a moral simoom. His tongue 'outvenoms all the worms of Nile.'"

I can make no comment on this "fruit of the spirit" of this organ of the Baptist denomination. It speaks for itself. It very appositely illustrates at least a portion of our present essay on the morality of Christians and of the religious press. One would imagine that a person of much conscientiousness who would dare thus publicly to deny a matter so easily tested, would, from self-respect, if he hates us more than he hates Satan, have strong evidence that we had spoken unadvisedly on the subject. But it appears that he had not one word of counter testimony whatever, except Mr. Fisher himself; and yet, without any other evidence than that of the accused, expresses himself in the above unenviable style!! He has not backed his assertion by a single witness; and even in the attempt to justify Fisher, or rather to

extenuate and prevaricate for him, he shows that he knew he had been one of us at the very time he so presumptuously denied my declaration, and seeks to quibble about the organization of the particular church in which he was at the time a member. Here is his proof:—

"If our information be correct, at the time alluded to by Mr. Campbell, his followers had no church in Middletown. Two of his daughters, two of his brothers-in-law, and some two or three students, whose membership was at Bethany and other reformed churches, used occasionally to meet and 'break the loaf:' but unless it is in accordance with the beauties of the reformation for persons to be members of two churches at once, there was no church of Mr. Campbell's order in or near Middletown at that time. Such is our information on the subject. So all that Mr. Campbell says on that subject is untrue."

His proof is all founded upon "IF his information be correct." What a conscience!! Such a bull of defamation resting upon one IF—upon the hypothetically true information of the accused and excommunicated Fisher himself!!

But it is in this case, as our traducers ought long since to have learned, a disastrous affair to them to put us to the proof of our morality in any matter which concerns their reputation. Out of Mr. Fisher's own mouth we shall convict him. He wrote as follows to the Post-Master at Middletown, Pa. about the time the Baptist Banner was undertaking his defence. This epistle clearly exhibits in what an agony he was to get out of the falsehood he proclaimed from the "sacred desk" in Indiana, and how reckless he was as to the means:—

GREENSBURG, KY, December 4, 1838.

Mr. P. M.:

Dear Sir—You will confer a favor on me by letting me know where Mr. James Sloan lives at this time. Please let me know whether the Campbellites have a church at Pleasant Hill, or not. Let me know what has become of black Israel, and whether he belongs to the Campbellites as yet, and what is his character. Please let me know what has become of John Agnew, W. Lindsey, Robert Sloane, and Mr. Neale, who were at Pleasant Hill Seminary, at the time I was, in the fall of 1830. I shall visit Middletown in the spring, no providential hindrance. Write, if you please, forthwith.

Your friend,

T. J. FISHER.

P. S. I wish you to ascertain if the Campbellites ever had a regularly constituted church at Pleasant Hill Seminary, and by whom it was constituted, and in what year.

T. J. FISHER.

Is it not evident from the letter, and from the editorial of the Banner, December 27, 1838, that there was an understanding between Messrs. Fisher and Waller as to the means by which the denial was to be sustained, by disputing the organization of the church that excluded him. The course machinated between these conspirators is as evident as that detailed between Ananias and Sapphira. They both tell the same story; but the sequel will show with what plausibility. Observe, courteous reader, Mr. Fisher does not ask any thing about his own membership, character, nor excommunication; but about some of his fellow-students and fellow-members of the church!! Why did he not ask for Dr. Pinkerton, on whose motion his case was taken up and himself excluded. Perhaps it was because he knew he was at this time in Kentucky!!! Well, I have called upon him for his recollections of the affair, because then a member of that church, and almost ever since absent from it. He testifies as follows:—

Brother Campbell,

In reply to your interrogatories, I answer—Early in January, 1831, I became acquainted with Mr. Fisher. He was introduced to me as a Christian brother, in fellowship with the congregation meeting for worship at that time about a mile from West

Middletown, Washington county, Pa. I soon learned that among the pupils at Pleasant Hill Seminary, Mr. Fisher enjoyed very little reputation for prudence or consistency of character. From observation in my daily intercourse with him, I was inclined to think that his indiscretions resulted from intellectual, rather than from moral disease; and looked upon him as unfortunate, rather than faulty. In February, however, it was thought that the reputation of the church required his expulsion, unless he would give assurances of a speedy reformation. A meeting was appointed for the consideration of his case, at which he failed to attend. The charges preferred against him were substantially these:—First, a levity of conduct, and an obsceneness of conversation wholly incompatible with the Christian profession; and second, an almost total disregard of the duties of the Lord's day. The writer of this note thought that Mr. Fisher had forgone all claim to the Christian fellowship of the congregation, and that the laws of Christ required, under all the circumstances of the case, his separation from the body. The church concurred, and he was expelled.

Such are my recollections of a part of Mr. Fisher's religious career at Pleasant Hill Seminary.

L. L. PINKERTON.

Now in Wellsburg, Va., May 9th, 1839.

But we have better testimony than even the unimpeachable testimony of Dr. Pinkerton, and the whole church at Pleasant Hill—better with Mr. Fisher, and better with Mr. Waller, because Mr. Fisher himself inquired for it. The name of Mr. Sloan is first on his list. Mr. Sloan, then, a teacher in the Academy at Pleasant Hill—a Presbyterian—a student of Theology, and now a Minister of the Presbyterian church. He thought that because Mr. Sloan was a *Presbyterian*, he might lean a little more towards a Baptist than towards a Disciple of Christ. But all Presbyterian ministers are not like Mr. Stiles, nor are all Baptist Editors like Mr. Waller. I rejoice to think there are hundreds of both Baptist and Presbyterian teachers and professors that would eschew such spirits and their deeds as they would the midnight assassin.

But we shall, without further ceremony, introduce that same Mr. Sloan, for whom Mr. Fisher inquires in his epistle:—

FRANKFORT, May 11th, 1839.

MR. A. CAMPBELL:

Dear Sir—In compliance with your request, preferred by Mr. Matthew M'Keever, I will endeavor to give you a brief sketch of the history of T. J. Fisher during his residence at Pleasant Hill Seminary. The first place I ever saw Mr. Fisher was in the pulpit of the Methodist meeting-house in West Middletown. He preached on that occasion; and in his address advocated the distinguishing doctrines held by that society known by the name of Disciples, or Campbellites. A portion of his address might be called a critical exercise or lecture, presenting a very learned exposition of a certain portion of the New Testament in the original text. I held an interview with him on the evening of the same day; and professing to have some knowledge of the Greek language, and, from Mr. Fisher's display in Middletown, supposing him to be a linguist, I was disposed to call in question some of his assertions respecting certain Greek words, an exposition of which he had given in his discourse. I soon discovered that he did not know a Greek letter. His conduct during his long stay with us, at the house of Mr. Matthew M'Keever, was inconsistent with the character of a preacher of truth and righteousness, which he then professed to be. His walk and conversation were not such as become the gospel of Christ. In the summer of the year 1830 I had the charge in (in connexion with Mrs. M'Keever) of Pleasant Hill Seminary. A congregation of Disciples met regularly in the Academy at that time.—During the winter session of the same year Mr Fisher was a regular student of Pleasant Hill Seminary. He professed to be a member of the church of Disciples which met there. I understood that charges had been preferred by that church against him during the time he was a student of that Seminary, and finally expelled. In the same meeting-house in which Mr Fisher first proclaimed his sentiments as one of the society of Disciples, I also heard him make a public renunciation of his connexion with that community. In speaking of Mr. Alexander Campbell, he said he was a gentleman and had always treated him kindly; that he believed he was sincere in his adherence to the principles which he advocated; and all that he had to say of him was, that he was self-deceived, and as such he pitied him. Of the cause which you plead he spoke unfavorably, acknowledging that there were some good things connected with it; but, as a whole, it was a dangerous and rotten system.

Yours most respectfully,

JAMES SLOAN.

N. B. If Mr. Fisher should refer to me for his character, you may present him with this communication.

May I not, then, leave this matter with the community without farther witness or comment? If necessary, scores of such testimony could be obtained. The church at Pleasant Hill existed before Mr. Fisher went to the Seminary, and it exists to this day an independent community, as all our communities are, whose acts are regarded by all churches that know them as the acts of any other congregation in the community.

I need only add, that the whole article in the Banner is a palpable evasion of my answer to Mr. Robinson. Not a word in my statement is even denied by Mr. Waller, except that Mr. Fisher is *not* NOW a fellow-revivalist with Mr. Maffit. He does not say how long since the partnership was dissolved. He may be right; and I may be misinformed as to the *day* when the co-partnacy ceased; but that does not affect this matter in the least. And I assert that not one word of my statement concerning Fisher is denied by Waller, notwithstanding all his horrible defamations. This is the man who goes for metaphysical regeneration, and tells his Christian experience!

I am sorry to have to expose such unchristian conduct in any fellow-mortal—much more in a Baptist Scribe; but my reputation is very dear to me, and of some value in this community, and it must be sustained. I am sorry to see that Mr. Fisher is not in the least reformed; and that instead of being grateful to me for the kindness I have shown him, and especially for the little that I have said about his character in comparison of what I could have said, he should dare to call my word in question. Surely he cannot think that I have forgotten all the meanness and unrighteousness of his course here about the time of his expulsion.

A. C.

News from the Churches.

Cincinnati, Ohio, February 8, 1839.

We have had reason of late to renew our thanks unto Him that dwells on high, that through his long suffering patience with the children of men, many hearts have been turned to seek the living and the true God, that they might find rest unto their souls.—Every day for a week past, some one, two, or more individuals have bowed in submission to the King of kings and Lord of Lords. May they be strengthened in their good resolves, and may they find the arm of the Lord a sure arm in all the days of their pilgrimage! For they that put their trust in the Lord shall never be confounded: great peace have they who love his law, and nothing shall offend them. Seeing that we hasten towards the last days of our probationary existence here, the disciples in this city seem to have aroused themselves to greater watchfulness, meditation, and prayer—a watchfulness over their thoughts, words, and actions—a meditation on the revealed will of the Highest, that they might conform themselves thereto—and to *prayer, nothing doubting*, but that the Lord will hear and answer and undertake for us, in our warfare against the impenitence and darkness of the age. May those things tend to stir up the brethren in your vicinity, and may the numbers of the faithful and valiant every where increase!

EDWARD B. HOWELLS.

Crawfordsville, Ten., January 25, 1839.

The good cause is still progressing, about forty-five having been added to our congregation during the last year, during which time we have had no stated preaching. We number now about one hundred and seventy, generally living disciples. We never fail to meet on the first day of every week to attend to the institutions of the Lord's house. May all Christian congregations live according to the discipline of the Divine Redeemer, that the beauties of the gospel may be exhibited to the conviction of all beholders.

FRANCIS MILLER.

Georgetown, Kentucky, February 7, 1839.

I have recovered sufficiently from the sciatic attack to go to Mount Vernon and hold a four days' meeting. Brother Parker, formerly a Baptist preacher, was with me on Friday and Saturday. He is a sound man and a good speaker, and I think he will do much good if he persevere, which there is not the least cause to doubt. Brother Pinkerton, whom you know, was with me all the time: and after brother Parker left, I made him speak all, and I exhorted. We obtained six additions, two of them were of the congregation formerly attended to by Dr. Fishback, and two were Baptists: all were worthy persons. The prospects are fine for increase. This is the second meeting in the meeting-house since our brethren succeeded, and we have had eight additions. I must say, that brother Pinkerton fills my eye. He is destined to do much good if he lives. I could sit and listen to him all the time. I bless the Lord that we have such young men in the ranks to fill the places of older men who are growing out of date.

J. T. JOHNSON.

Georgetown, Kentucky, February 28, 1839.

I have just reached home with our worthy young brother Pinkerton, from a tour of about twelve days, including the 3d and 4th Lord's days in this month. We spent, at the start, Thursday and Friday at Shelbyville, brother William Morton being with us all the time, where we gained eight valuable additions, three of whom were Baptists.

On Saturday morning we proceeded to Chinnoweth's Run, in Jefferson county, within three miles of Jeffersontown, 12 miles from Louisville, a part of the field of brother Pinkerton's labors, where Mr. Stiles had, a few days previously assailed us with his accustomed vehemence and recklessness. Our labors were confined to those places and their vicinities for nine days, with the exception of three efforts at Middletown, four miles distant from Jeffersontown During that time forty-nine valuable additions were made to this glorious cause at the two first named places, and three at the latter; which makes sixty in twelve days. What a glorious triumph of the gospel! Prospects were still brilliant, but prior indispensable engagements called us home.

Brother G. Gates was with us on Saturday night and fourth Lord's day; and we left him there on Monday morning to make another effort. May the Lord bless and preserve you many years; and may your efforts be abundantly blessed until you shall be called home from the field of battle.

J. T. JOHNSON.

May's Lick, Kentucky, December 3, 1838.

We have just closed an interesting meeting here, brother John Allen Gano and R. C. Ricketts being the speakers. Three were added by the confession of their faith and immersion, and two who had previously obeyed the Lord. The good cause we think is still gaining in this section, notwithstanding all opposition. Greater is He who is the author of the gospel, and who is with them who plead for and obey *the truth*, than all who oppose it. Blessed be the name of the Lord! Let us take courage and press on.

ASA R. RUNYAN.

Gosport, Indiana, January 22, 1839.

The brethren in this state are now deliberating upon the propriety of holding a general meeting at Indianapolis, to commence on Friday before the 2d Lord's day in June next. The desire of the brethren is, that brother A. Campbell would attend this meeting. Can you come? Will you come, brother Campbell? The design of this meeting is similar to that of your meetings on the Western Reserve, called "The School of the Preachers;" but when the matter is determined I will address you again. The cause of Messiah is rapidly advancing in some parts of this state. We have immersed about one hundred persons in Owen county since September last. I have just heard that brother J. M'Vay has immersed seventy in Danville, Ia., since November last. Praised be the Lord!

The Presbyterians have refused Dr. Wiley their pulpit, as I am informed by a member.

J. M. MATTHEWS.

Millersburg, Callaway county, Missouri, December 1e, 1838

The cause of truth is still on the advance in this quarter. About twenty have been added to the Millersburg church during the year, which has nearly closed. Brethren Jones and Jacob Coons, with myself, held a two days' meeting, including the third Lord's day in last month, on the Nine Mile Prairie. Five made the good confession; and notwithstanding the weather was very cold and the ice upwards of two inches thick, three had sufficient moral courage to induce them to be immersed. Brother Jones had meeting again at the same place on the first Lord's day in this month, when three or four others made the good confession, and some were immersed Brother Jacob Coons has meeting in the neighborhood to-day, and we hope he will have good success; but probably more on this subject hereafter.

JOSEPH COONS.

Celemansville, January 20, 1839.

The church in this vicinity is attended by brother John Pope—numbers seventy-five members—constituted on the 31st Feqruary, 1832—ten additions during last summer—prospects good—sectarianism on the wane, and of course but little persecution. May the Lord increase our number of Christian proclaimers, as we suffer very much for want of them. If you should ever come this way again, please give us a passing call, and let me know when a few days beforehand. Situation fifty miles south of Cincinnati, on the road to Paris, Ky.

SOLOMON C. PERRIN.

Bedford, Cuyahoga county, Ohio, January 9, 1839.

The church in this place, previous to August, 1837, had been for some time laboring under unpropitious circumstances, insomuch that at that time there were less than thirty members belonging to the church, and only six of them male members; and, in my absence, but one who took any part in public meetings; and he, though a very good man, but little gifted in speech. Yet they continued faithfully to meet on the first day of every week, and to attend to the institutions of the Lord's house, and the Lord has abundantly rewarded them for their faithfulness. On the 3d Lord's day of that month I had the pleasure of waiting upon brother Jesse Robison and a sister while they put on the Lord. Since which time more than sixty have been added to us by immersion, eight or ten from the sects around us, and a number by letter; so that we now number one hundred.

Brother Robison has become a public speaker, and has labored some abroad, and several of the brethren are in the habit of teaching their neighbors in public, and many more from house to house.

On Sunday, the 11th of November, of last year, sister Wills, formerly of the Baptists, the lady who built a meeting-house some years since, at her own expense, united with us; and the same evening an adopted daughter of hers obeyed the Lord, and the next day ere her own daughter obeyed. Thus did the Lord pour out a blessing upon her at once. The same day brother Robison was blessed of the Lord in beholding his mother, formerly a Presbyterian, put on the Lord in baptism, with two others; and if we all continue to walk humbly before God in the love of Jesus, and of one another, we shall be blessed still more; which is the prayer of yours in the Lord,

J. M. MOSS.

Pembroke, Genesee county, New York, December 11, 1838.

Brother J. J. Moss and myself have just closed meetings at Clarence and Williamsville, Erie county, this and the preceding week; at which places nine persons were persuaded to obey the Lord in "the things that were appointed for them to do."

A. P JONES.

New York City, May 15, 1839.

I am happy to inform you that we are in a very prosperous state in Lawrens street. We have had nearly forty additions, chiefly by immersion, since January last. Blessed be the Lord for his goodness! I have sent you an essay written by one of our members, James Farquherson, from London. Will you give it a place in the Harbinger when you have room?* Let me have a long letter from you, if you can spare time. A number of the brethren are anxious to know if you are going to England this season.† Let me know.

D. MONRO.

M'Coupin county, Illinois, April 29, 1839.

I attended a meeting on the South Fork of Sangamon river, in Sangamon county, in company with brother Walter Bowles, on the 2d Lord's day in March, which continued till Tuesday following. Eleven bowed to the King's authority. On the 4th Lord's day in the same month four more were added by immersion, and the brethren rejoiced in the Lord. There are eleven congregations in Sangamon county; one at Springfield; one 14 miles to the south of that, on Lick creek; one at Athens, 14 miles north-west of Springfield; one on the Lake Fork of Salt creek, north-east of Springfield; one on Conrad's creek; one on Wolf Creek; one at Sugar Grove; one on the South Fork of Sangamon river; one at Germany, five miles west of Springfield; one at Island Grove, and one at *Chany's Grove*. We give this information that the brethren travelling through this state may know where to find us and visit us on their journey.

ROBERT FOSTER.

Georgetown, Kentucky, May 2, 1839.

On Tuesday last I reached home from a tour of sixteen days at New Athany and Charleston in Indiana. At the former place I spent nine days, and had the pleasure of gaining thirty accessions to the good cause of our Lord. Brother Brown came for me on *Lord's day* evening from Charleston, where he had delivered several addresses, and on Monday morning we repaired to the field of battle. The congregation was in waiting when we reached the house, and I was much elated at appearances. We commenced one of the most interesting meetings of modern days. Within seven days we gained seventy *seven additions* to the cause of Heaven and of Heaven's King. It was a most glorious victory. The prospects were good for as many more; but I was compelled to return home to my family and to meet the Trustees of our College.

The Trustees of the College have had a meeting which closed to-day. They have located the College at Harrodsburg, inasmuch as they made the most liberal offer for it. One hundred scholarships have been obtained, with ten thousand dollars to erect buildings, &c. I shall still labor for its success: but I expect to spend my days in Georgetown. May the Lord bless our efforts to sustain it!

J. T. JOHNSON.

Evergreen, South Carolina, April 18, 1839.

The opposition of the Baptists is increasing. I learned a few days since that brother Henry, of Barnwell District, has been excluded for breaking bread with the Disciples at Erwinton. The same church had commenced *dealing* (as they call their mock trials) with sister Evans for the same conduct. It is perfectly astonishing to what lengths an up-

* *I will.* † *I cannot go this year.*

righteous opposition will cause some to go who profess to love the truth. The Baptist church in the neighborhood of Captain Bush has excluded two of its members for saying that, as far as they had examined our views, they could not object to them, and that the Bible alone was their *only* guide in matters of Christian faith and manners. This I believe I mentioned in my last. Since that, the same church has manifested its abhorrence of the 'Bible alone doctrine' in a most ridiculous manner. *The members have actually excommunicated their* MEETING-HOUSE. That building was as guilty as the members they excluded. But you may ask, How did *it* offend? It said nothing; but it did not fall and crush your brethren E. A. S. and J. M. B., who, at the invitation of those who had an acknowledged right to use it, preached in it to the people who assembled. They did not examine its walls to discover whether or not any *moral leprosy* adhered to them. Please tell the American, English, Scotch, Irish, and Canadian readers of the Millennial Harbinger, that the *Regular Baptist Union* church has most irregularly become *divided* on the subject of *baptism*, and not only excluded two of its members for believing in Christian immersion, but have really excommunicated their meeting-house, and now hold their meetings under an arbor in the woods. Perhaps I ought to mention that the Rev. Mr. Ardis has been at the head of all these proceedings. He declared that he never would enter the pulpit again if we preached from it, and two of his brethren then vowed that they never would enter the house again if we desecrated it by our use of it. And as pine trees are more abundant than such enlightened and pious souls, the church concluded that it would be wiser to give up the house than these members. However, we have, by this new movement, a house without building one—so you will not be compelled to preach in a cold and open piazza in that vicinity when you next visit South Carolina. But I will not trouble you further at present than to remark, that the truth is making some headway in our state, and that the time is not far distant when a general burst of honest indignation at the conduct of the clergy will bring those men to their senses.

J. M. BARNES.

Lexington, Kentucky, May 4, 1839.

Brother Johnson is now with us, and will probably remain for some days. The prospects are good for many additions. Five have confessed within a few days, and two received by letter.

I take a pleasure in informing you that our difficulties have been amicably settled by the adoption of your preamble and two first resolutions, and the change we proposed in the third, so as to require the minority to submit to the majority of the congregation present. I do not anticipate any further difficulty, as those brethren who left us seem fully convinced of the impropriety of their course.

J. G. CHINN.

Cold Brook, Warren county, Illinois, February 25, 1838.

The congregation here numbers more than two hundred members. We are at peace among ourselves, meet every Lord's day to break bread, contribute as the Lord has prospered us, and attend to all the forms of worship. We have during the present winter received more than thirty accessions. During the last six months we have made considerable advances in peace among ourselves—and holiness, without which, an Apostle says, no man shall see the Lord. The brethren have it contemplation to form two more churches out of the present one.

Sometime in October last an individual came among us who has caused us much trouble. He calls himself *Scuyler R. Milton;* but we believe him to be *Spencer K. Milton*, who has been recently published as an impostor. He came from the same congregation in Indiana to which the brethren belong who published the advertisement in the January number of the Millennial Harbinger. He came well recommended, and joined our congregation. We believe here that he is the identical S. K. Milton, and that he has been guilty of the basest conduct in Indiana, and that he is guilty of forgery here in several instances. He possesses the most consummate impudence, and is an adept in the tactics of deception. We have taken means to trace him out and publish his meandering to the world from the beginning of his deceptions.

Brother Campbell, if you are in possession of any facts that will throw any light on this perplexing subject, do let us have them immediately. If you are acquainted personally with Dr. S. K. Milton, please give me a minute description of his person. If he is the individual that is here, he presents a very singular appearance, and will be easily described.* I hope you can find leisure enough to attend to this matter. The cause is suffering greatly on account of him. We wish fully to become acquainted with his history in order that we may set the matter to rest, and render it impossible for him to impose on the brethren any where. May the good Lord protect us against all imposition, and preserve us from all evil!

J. B. REYNOLS.

The cause of reformation still advances in England. Brother Davis, of Nottingham, has had printed one or two editions of the New version. To this magnanimous and generous disciple of Christ I am indebted for a very rich and acceptable present—a copy of "The

* I am not so well acquainted with Milton as to describe him better than you have done. I have no doubt he is a base impostor. He collected a considerable sum of money for me, and pretended that he lost it. I have heard of him practising similar frauds. He ought to be accurately described.

A. C.

Book of the New Covenant of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; being a critical revision of the text and translation of the English version of the New Testament," 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1837—by Granville Penn, Esq. Also, a Supplementhry Annotatien to the same book, by the same author, 1838. Together with the British Critic, reviewing the same, for July, 1837. Mr Penn deserves the thanks of all Bible students for these valuable offerings to the treasury of biblical literature and criticism. I have the works still under examination, and may speak of them more fully hereafter.

Brother Wallis, of Nottingham, in addition to the Christian Messenger and various republications of the American press, has had a large edition of the debate with Robert Owen printed and published. Sustained by the Christian liberality, enterprize, and devoted labors of such men, the cause of reformation cannot, under the blessings which has ever attended such efforts, but go forward in the favored land of our beloved ancestors.

A. C.

Queries.

1. If any man or woman in the reformation refuses to break the loaf with a congregation, when among them, or leaves the congregation at the time they are about to break the loaf, without giving a reason for doing so, ought they not to apologize for their contemptuous conduct towards the church of Christ before they ever break the loaf with them again?

2. Have the Elders of a church any example from the primitive disciples the right to refuse or reject any man or woman that confesses that Jesus Christ is the Messiah, the Son of God, *when they have heard of their disorderly character*, without evidence of reformation, before admission into the ordinance and the church?

3. Is it consistent with the gospel to bring into the church of Christ one who has been unfortunately immersed in disorder, when it would drive out its orderly members, or divide the church of Christ?

T. H.

QUERIES ANSWERED.

1. I think as much, at least, is due to Christ's family as to your family or mine; and I am sure if a member of either of our families, when the supper table was spread and furnished, and we were about partaking, should suddenly seize his hat and walk out, *good manners* require, if he return the next meal, that he should offer some explanation, if not an apology. For my part, I could not esteem such a person a gentleman if he would not apologize; and is not a Christian a gentleman?

2. Certainly they have. Would Peter and his companions have communed with Simon Magus after he offered them money for the Spirit, without reformation?

3. No one has a right to cause any good and orderly disciple to stumble or be offended by forcing himself or any one else into a community without its consent, and more especially when there is any suspicion resting upon the character of the person seeking for admission. We ought not to offend a Christian of good standing for the sake of theory, or of experimenting upon a person of doubtful character.

A. C.

The following queries came here during my absence, and have just now come up in review. They shall be engrossed in an essay next month. A. C.

1st. Ought a disciple, that publicly offends, to be tried in the *public* congregation?

2d. If tried publicly, ought he to be reproved publicly, if he confesses and solemnly promises to offend no more?

3d. Ought he, if he reforms, to be admitted immediately after his trial and confession, to the enjoyment of the privileges of the congregation?

4th. What are the advantages, or is there any advantage arising to the church, or the offender, from public trial and rebuke?

Can the above queries be answered in the next number? Perhaps we could find an answer to each in some parts of your writings; but we wish to hear from you again on this subject.

Or if you do not find it convenient to answer these questions, a few remarks on this passage of the Holy Oracles will be very acceptable: "Them that sin, rebuke before ALL; that others also may fear." 1 Tim. v. 20. Another question suggests itself: Are not the words "excommunication," "interdiction," and "absolution," of a piece with many other antichristian terms and phrases; and would it not be better to employ the words of the Holy Spirit in all cases?

These inquiries are respectfully submitted to your consideration for the benefit of those whom we love in the truth. Z.

MR. SKINNER.

We have not heard from Mr. Skinner for many months. We know not whether he has returned to the United States. There are due him 6 pages and me 7, according to stipulation, to close the controversy. We want to hear whether six pages will suffice him before we prepare our last letter. A. C.

OBITUARY.

In the triumphs of the Christian hope, died the excellent and amiable sister RACHEL BOOTWRIGHT, daughter of brother William Bootwright, of Richmond, Va. at the residence of her father, on the 25th April.

May 5th, died in his 56th year, SILAS M. NOEL, D. D., at his residence in Lexington, Ky. We are glad to learn that his proscriptive zeal against reformation gradually abated as he approached the end of his course. A. C.

CORRESPONDENTS.

The long article in the beginning of this number has excluded communications from brethren Hurlbut, Howard, Henley, A. P. Jones, Yearnshaw, Winans, J. Challen, and others; which, with *Christianus*, shall appear in our next.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME III.——NUMBER VII.

BETHANY, VA. *JULY*, 1839.

HINTS TO YOUNG CONVERTS.

BIBLE-READING.

BETHPHAGE, May 10th, 1839.

Brother Campbell,

From the name of the place at which I write this, you will suppose, of course, that I am not very far from *Bethany*. Nor will you judge incorrectly; for, from this lofty eminence and from beneath the boughs which overshadow me, I see, at the distance of about a mile, spread out like a beautiful landscape upon canvass, the fertile valley in which Bethany is situated, with its fields arrayed in the deepest verdure; and its winding stream, whose sparkling waters, ever and anon bursting upon the sight, reflect the sun-beams.

It must be confessed, indeed, with regard to these localities, that however the one may, by its proximity, justify the appellation given to the other, neither of them can boast either dates or figs to support the commonly received etymology of their names.* Yet as we are wont to speak and act from our feelings and circumstances, it is natural that we should be in this matter influenced by a love for the places so often visited by our Lord, and by those scriptural associations which so readily present themselves to us; and, as we cannot really enter into Jerusalem, that we should, in fancy at least, wish to get as near to it as we can. There is, however, another derivation of these names, which makes Bethany import *The house of song*, and Bethphage, *The house of the feast;* which, if taken in a religious sense, might better sanction our application of them,—with the proviso that we exchange the one for the other; for whatever *we* may do in the way of song, certain it is that the spiritual and intellectual banquet is with *you*. And surely if

* Bethany, *the house of dates;* Bethphage, *the house of figs.*

lovers of profane antiquity may revive their classical reminiscences by the use of ancient appellations, and strangers from a foreign land delight to recall the images of places endeared to them in their native country by bestowing their names upon their new abodes; it may be permitted to us, by such an appropriation of names consecrated by the most interesting incidents of sacred history, to renew the memory of the past, to enhance present joys and brighten future hopes; so that, although the fig-tree shall not blossom in our land, and the palm shall yield no fruit, we may nevertheless rejoice in the Lord and joy in the God of our salvation.

It is indeed with such feelings and for such an end that we dwell upon the memorials of events recorded in the inspired volume, or that we again and again peruse this divine record itself. Through such remembrancers we have fellowship with the departed, and not only are the dead revived to us, but their meed of praise for noble and virtuous deeds is secured to them from age to age. Lazarus again comes forth from the tomb bound with grave-clothes; the widow of Nain clasps again to her bosom her son and only stay, brought back to life; the tears of Mary become to her more precious for ornament—for glory and renown, than if they had been transmuted into diamonds and pearls; the glad hosannas which hailed our Lord's ascent of Olivet are again heard, or at the foot of the cross we can see the triumph of affection over suffering, hear the last accents of consolation to that heart-wounded mother, and contemplate at once the dizzy height of earthly guilt and the unfathomed depth of the love of Heaven.

To the Christian who makes the Bible what it ought to be—his *vade mecum*, there is scarce a remark or an incident even in the common affairs of life which will not suggest some pleasing or useful reflection. While the man of the world delights to carnalize spiritual things, he loves to spiritualize carnal things. He finds 'sermons in stones and good in every thing.' The storehouse of his memory is filled with the things new and old of the heavenly kingdom; and like the person who had tasted Lotus, who according to the ancients had never afterwards a relish for any thing beside, he derives from the Bible all his joy and consolation. How happy is his condition! His eyes are anointed with an eye-salve more potent than that of the fatted Arabian dervise which could only reveal the secret treasures of earth, while the former gives power to survey the riches of heaven; the affections of his soul are elevated and purified, and he lives and moves in a celestial atmosphere in which all nature seems to him to wear a brighter aspect.

And here permit me to express the pleasure I have experienced in seeing those excellent pieces which you have lately published upon

Bible reading, and the nature and design of the Christian institution.—Now that 'the south wind blows softly' and your vessel is safely moored in the 'fair havens,' it is well to discipline the crew and be prepared for any Euroclydon. Or, in plain parlance, as your southern controversies are softened down, it is certainly well to direct the attention of your readers, and particularly the young converts, to themes of such paramount and practical importance. Not that I object to controversy. This must live as long as error. It began with Satan, and can only end with him. But "*omne nimium nocet*"—'too much of one thing is good for nothing,' and I therefore do not love stormy and long protracted debates, which are for the most part inutile, and often inimical to good temper. I like to hear thunder now and then, but a great deal of it will turn the best beer in the world into vinegar.

But to return to the subject: Does it not appear that the chief preventive of biblical study with young converts consists in this—that they suppose themselves already proficient? And is there not something in our circumstances which creates this mistaken sentiment of self-approval? Is it, think you, occasioned by influences political or social; or is it owing to climate? Every thing certainly grows with great rapidity in this country. As a nation we have scarcely known the period of youth, but have passed at once from infancy to maturity. Here, too, in society, we have not infants of years, but men of days, for those whom we have known as children of yesterday are to-day of full age and wiser than their teachers. And so is it with our seasons; for we have as it were no spring, but the hoar frosts and icicles of winter are at once exchanged for the dews and leafy boughs of summer. Can it be possible that any of these circumstances lead to a similar precocity in spiritual growth? For it is undeniable that many seem to come forth from the laver of regeneration, like the fabled Minerva, out of Jupiter's head, not only fully grown, but fully armed.

Or, is this overweening self-confidence the result of the mistaken views of conversion which have been so prevalent? It is certainly the natural tendency of the doctrine of miraculous influences in conversion, to lead the convert to repose exclusively upon his "experience" for his assurance of spiritual maturity, and to undervalue and despise the slow and tedious process of growing by the 'milk of the word.' And is it either impossible or improbable that many erroneously place the same deceitful reliance upon their baptism? In either case the consequences will be the same, and we shall have revealed the cause of that neglect of Bible reading which is so generally and so alarmingly prevalent.

Precocity, even when it really exists in a remarkable degree, is but a mark of weakness, and, being so, is certainly more to be deprecated

in the religious department than any other. But how much more imbecile and unfortunate is that false estimate of ourselves by which we are blinded to our own deficiencies, and rendered ignorant of our own ignorance! As, however, I intend nothing more than a hint upon the subject, I shall leave it to your more able pen to trace out the true causes of neglect of biblical study, and to enforce this most important duty. Oh! that young converts may devote themselves to the law of the Lord, and that his testimonies may be their constant meditation. By these will they be nourished, preserved, invigorated, and rendered fruitful. By communion here with the ancients who obtained a good report, and in fellowship with God and Jesus Christ our Lord through the written word and the divine Spirit, they can alone be prepared for the full fruition of the great and precious promises of the gospel.

R. R.

CHRISTIANS AMONG THE SECTS—*No. V.*

POSITIVE ORDINANCES.

CHRISTIANOS is on the King's business; and his command is, "Salute no man by the way." Controversy is *right*, and necessary too sometimes; as when the infidel comes forward to strike at the foundation of the Christian hope, or the Catholic to sustain the pretensions of "the Man of Sin;" then would I meet them in "the armor of righteousness." But controversy is only to be chosen as the *less of two evils.* Its bitter waters have caused the whole religious world to sicken and die. But to resume my subject.

I am overwhelmed with this subject as I proceed. I again repeat the language of a former essay—The state of the *heart* is the *all in all* in the scriptures. The Psalmist exclaims, "For thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it: thou delightest not in burnt offerings. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." Again, in the 50th Psalm how does the Most High rebuke the vain ostentation of Israel, who supposed they were ministering to his wants in offering their sacrifice and incense: "I will not reprove thee for thy sacrifices or thy burnt offerings, to have been continually before me. I will take no bullock out of thy house, nor he-goat out of thy fold. For every beast of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills. I know all the fowls of the mountains, and the wild beasts of the field are mine. If I were hungry, I would not tell thee: for the world is mine, and the fulness thereof. Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats? Offer unto God *thanksgivings*, and pay thy vows unto the Most High; and call upon me in the day of trouble: I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me." How uncompromising and indignant is the language of the great

Jehovah, uttered by the Prophet Isaiah to this people, on the comparative value of positive ordinances and moral duties! "Hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of Sodom; and give ear to the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah: To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord. I am full of the burnt offerings of rams and the fat of *fed* beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he-goats. When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hands, to tread my courts? Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and Sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with: it is iniquity even the solemn meeting. Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth: they are a trouble to me; I am weary to bear them. And when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you; yea, when ye make many prayers I will not hear." We are ready to exclaim, What means this? Did not the Lord appoint these institutions—the sacrifice and incense—the feasts, and the prayers too? Yes, verily; but it was for the purpose of promoting moral purity, and not as a commutation for every abomination—not to purchase a license to sin. The Most High gives the reason why the observance of these things were thus regarded by him—"Your hands are filled with blood." He therefore calls upon them, "Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil, learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow. Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." And by the same Prophet, in the 58th chapter, the Lord, after denouncing their fasts in the severest terms, besause of the state of their hearts, he says to them, "Is not this the *fast* that I have chosen?—to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor, that are cast out, to thy house? When thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh? Then shall thy light break forth as the morning, and thine health shall spring forth speedily, and thy righteousness shall go before thee; the glory of the Lord shall be thy rereward."

But if we leave the Old Testament and come to the *New*—is not the state of the heart made every thing there? "How can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." Again, "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts," &c.—"these are the things that defile the man." "For thy *heart* is not *right* in the sight of God," said a holy Apostle to Simon the magician. He had idols there. "Set your *affections* on things above, and not on things on the earth," says Paul. Again, "The *love* of money is the root of all evil;" not money itself, as is usually represented; but *the love* of it. It was said by the Prophet concerning our Lord, six hundred years before his advent, "And the *idols* he shall utterly abolish." This is no *less* true in its *spiritual* than in its literal sense. He casts out *all* idols from the heart wherever he takes possession. He will never consent to divide the heart with any being or object.—How divinely does the Apostle speak to the Corinthians! "I am jealous over you, with godly jealousy; for I have espoused you to one husband, that

I might present you a chaste virgin to Christ." With what preventive wisdom does our glorious Leader, who "walked in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks, and held in his right hand the seven stars," detect the germ of apostacy in the *hearts* of his disciples! The church at Ephesus he commends for every virtue; yet says, "Nevertheless I have this against thee, that thou hast left thy first love." Here is a premonitory symptom of a fatal disease, which, if neglected, would soon be irremediable; as one said, "A single drop of water oozing through the dykes of Holland, if unperceived, would desolate the fairest portions of that country." Therefore our Lord timely admonishes, "Remember, therefore, whence thou art *fallen*, and repent, and do thy first works; or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will remove thy candlestick out of its place, except thou repent." And the Laodiceans were so perfect in all the externals of religion, that they boasted, saying, "I am rich and increased in goods, and have need of nothing;" and our Lord so far admits their pretensions that he does not bring against them *one* charge of immorality, or of neglect of one external duty; yet says to them, "Because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth. Thou knowest not that thou art poor, and wretched, and miserable, and blind, and naked. I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes with eye-salve, that thou mayest see. As many as I love I rebuke and chastise; be zealous, therefore, and repast."

CHRISTIANOS.

THE ROMANTIC IN RELIGION AND MORALITY.

A STRIKING departure from the order of custom in that rank to which a man belongs, by devoting the privileges of that rank to a mode of excellence which the people who compose it never dreamed to be a duty, will by them be denominated *romantic*. They will wonder why a man that ought to be just like themselves, should affect quite a different style of life—should attempt unusual plans of doing good—should distaste the society of his class, and should put himself under some extraordinary discipline of virtue, though *every point of his system* may be the dictate of *reason and conscience*.

The irreligious will apply this epithet to the determination to make, and the zeal to inculcate great exertions and sacrifices for a purely moral ideal reward. Some gross and palpable prize is requisite to excite their energies; and therefore self-denial repaid by conscience, beneficence without fame, and the *delight* of resembling the Divinity, appear very visionary felicities.

The epithet will often be applied to a man who feels it an imperious duty to realize, as far as possible, and as soon as possible, every thing which in theory he approves and applauds. You will often hear a circle of perhaps respectable persons agreeing entirely that the one is an excellent principle of action, and that other an amiable quality, and a third a sublime excellence, who would be amazed at your fanaticism

if you were to adjure them thus: 'My friends, from this moment you are bound—from this moment we are all bound, on peril of the displeasure of God, to realize in ourselves, to the last possible extent, all that we have thus applauded.'

Through a fatal defect of conscience, there is a very general feeling, regarding the high honor of moral and religious attainments, that though it is a glorious and happy exaltation to possess them, yet it is perfectly safe to stop contented where we are. One is confounded to hear irritable persons applauding a character of self-command; persons who trifle away their days admiring the instances of a strenuous improvement of time; rich persons praising examples of extraordinary beneficence which they know far surpasses themselves, though without large means; and all expressing their deep respect for the men who have been most eminent for devotional habits;—and yet apparently with no consciousness that they are themselves placed in a solemn election of henceforth striving in earnest to exemplify this very same pitch of character, or of being condemned in the day of judgment.

Finally, in the application of this epithet but little allowance is generally made for the very great difference between a man's entertaining high designs and hopes for himself alone, and his entertaining them relative to other persons. It may be very romantic for a man to promise himself to effect such designs upon others, as it may be very reasonable to meditate for himself. If he feels the powerful habitual impulse of conviction prompting him to the *highest* attainments of wisdom and excellence, he may perhaps justly hope to approach them himself, though it would be most extravagant to extend the same hope to all the persons to whom he may try to impart the impulse.

I specify the attainments of *wisdom* and *excellence*—because, to the distinction between the designs and hopes which a man might entertain for himself, and those which he might have respecting others, it is necessary to add a further distinction as to the nature of those which he might entertain only for himself. His extraordinary plans and expectations for himself might be of such a nature as to depend on other persons for their accomplishment, and might therefore be as extravagant as if other persons alone had been their object. Or, on the contrary, they may be of a kind which shall not need the co-operation of other persons, and may be realized independently of their will. The design of acquiring immense riches, or becoming the commander of an army, or the legislator of a nation, must in its progress be dependent on other beings besides the individual, in too many thousand points for a considerate man to presume that he shall be fortunate in them all. But the schemes of eminent personal attainments, not being dependent in any of these ways, are romantic *only* when there is some *fatal intellectual or moral defect in the mind itself which has adopted them.*

[*Communicated by* C. D. HURLBUTT.]

THE JEWS.

EVERY thing concerning the Jews, as a people, is daily becoming more interesting to the Christian community. The following article we have no doubt will be read with interest by our most intelligent readers:— *Ed. M. H.*

From the London Quarterly Review.

STATE AND PROSPECTS OF THE JEWS.

Our lot is cast in very wonderful times. We have reached, as it were Mount Pisgah in our march; and we may discern from its summit the dim though certain outlines of coming events. The tide of action seems to be rolling back from the west to the east; a spirit, akin to that of Moses when he beheld the Land of Promise in faith and joy, is rising up among the nations;—whatever concerns the Holy Land is heard and read with lively interest; its scenery, its antiquities, its past history and future glories engage alike the traveller and the divine—hundreds of strangers now tread the sacred soil for one that visited it in former days; Jerusalem is once more a centre of attraction; the curious and the devout flock annually thither from all parts of America and Europe, accomplishing in their laudable pursuit the promise of God to the beloved city—"Whereas thou hast been forsaken and hated so that no man passed through thee, I will make thee an eternal excellency, the joy of many generations."

It would indeed be surprising if the wide diffusion of knowledge among all classes of the civilized world did not create a wider diffusion of interest for the history and localities of Palestine. All that can delight the eye and feed the imagination is lavished over its surface; the lovers of scenery can find there every form and variety of landscape; the snowy heights of Lebanon with its cedars, the valley of Jordan, the mountains of Carmel, Tabor, and Hermon, and the waters of Galilee, are as beautiful as in the days when David sang their praise, and far more interesting by the accumulation of reminiscences. The land, unbroken by the toils of the husbandman, yet "enjoys her Sabbaths;" but Eshcol, Bashan, Sharon, and Gilead are still there, and await but the appointed hour (so we may gather from every narrative) to sustain their millions; to flow, as of old, with milk and honey; to become once more "a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths that spring out of valleys and hills; a land of wheat, and barley, and vines, and fig-trees, and pomegranates, olive-oil, and honey;" and to resume their ancient and rightful titles, "The Garden of the Lord," and "The Glory of all Lands." What numberless recollections are crowded upon every footstep of the sacred soil! Since the battle of the five kings against four, recorded in the 14th chapter of Genesis, nearly two thousand years before the time of our Saviour, until the wars of Napoleon, eighteen hundred years after it, this narrow but wonderful region has never ceased to be the stage of remarkable events. If, for the sake of brevity, we omit the enumeration of spots signalized by the exploits of the children of Israel, to which, however, a traveller may be guided by Holy Writ with all the minuteness and accuracy of a road book, we shall yet be engaged by the scenes of many brilliant and romantic achievements of the ancient and modern world:—Take the plain of Esdraelon alone, the ancient valley of Jezreel, a scanty spot of twenty-five miles long, and varying from six to fourteen in breadth; yet more recollections are called up here than suffice for the annals of many nations. Here by the banks of "the ancient river, the river Kishon," "the stars in their courses fought against Sisera," the object of the immortal song of Deborah and Barak; and here too is Megiddo, signal-

ized by the death of the "good Josiah." Each year, in a long succession of time, brought fresh events; the armies of Antiochus and of Rome, Egyptians, Persians, Turks, and Arabs, the fury of the Saracens, and the mistaken piety of the crusaders, have found, in their turn, the land "as the garden of Eden before them, and have left it a desolate wilderness." Nor did it escape the ferocious gripe of the revolutionary war; the arch-destroyer of mankind sent his armies thither under the command of General Kleber, and in 1799 gave the last memorial of blood to those devoted plains.

But how small and transitory are all such reminiscences to those which must rivet the attention and feelings of the pious believer! If Johnson could regard that man as little to be envied who could stand unmoved on Iona, or Marathon, or any spot dignified by wisdom, bravery, or virtue, what must we say of one who cared not to tread Mount Zion or Calvary, or could behold with unmoistened eye,

> ——"Those holy fields,
> Over whose acres walked those blessed feet,
> Which eighteen hundred years ago were nail'd,
> For our advantage, on the bitter cross"?

We have heard, indeed, that few persons can contemplate the Holy City for the first time without emotion: not long ago it was brought to our knowledge that two young men (and they were not especially serious,) on arriving within sight of its walls and mountains, struck by the *religio loci*, "How dreadful is this place! This is none other than the house of God, and this is the gate of heaven," slipped involuntarily from their camels, and fell into an attitude of adoration.

This interest is not confined to the Christians—it is shared and avowed by the whole body of the Jews, who no longer conceal their hope and belief that the time is not far distant, when "the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea; and shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel; and shall gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth."

Doubtless this is no new sentiment among the children of the dispersion. The novelty of the present day does not lie in the indulgence of such a hope by that venerable people—but in their fearless confession of the hope; and in the approximation of spirit between Christians and Hebrews, to entertain the same belief of the future glories of Israel, to offer up the same prayer, and look forward to the same consummation. In most former periods a development of religious feeling has been followed by a persecution of the ancient people of God; from the days of Constantine to Leo XII., the disciples of Christ have been stimulated to the oppression of the children of Israel; and Heaven alone can know why myriads of that suffering race fell beneath the *piety* of the crusaders, as they marched to recover the sepulchre of their Saviour from the hands of the Infidels. But a mighty change has come over the hearts of the Gentiles; they seek now the temporal and eternal peace of the Hebrew people; societies are established in England and Germany to diffuse among them the light of the gospel; and

the increasing accessions to the parent Institution in London attest the public estimation of its principles and services.

Encouraged by these proofs of a bettered condition, and of the sympathy of the Gentiles who so lately despised them, the children of Israel have become far more open to Christian intercourse and reciprocal inquiry. Both from themselves and their converted brethren we learn much of their doings, much of their hopes and fears, that a few years ago would have remained in secret. One of them, who lately, in the true spirit of Moses, went a journey into Poland, "unto his brethren, and looked on their burdens," informs that "several thousand Jews of that country and of Russia have recently bound themselves by an oath, that as soon as the way is open for them to go up to Jerusalem, they will immediately go thither, and there spend their time in fasting and praying unto the Lord, until he shall send the Messiah. * * * * * * Although it was," he continues, "comparatively a short time since I had intercourse with my brethren according to the flesh, I found a mighty change in their minds and feelings in regard to the nearness of their deliverance. Some assigned one reason, and some another, for the opinion they entertained; but all agreed in thinking that the time is at hand." Large bodies, moreover, have acted on this impulse; we state, on the authority of another gentleman, himself a Jewish Christian, that the number of Jews in Palestine has been multiplied twenty fold; that, though within the last forty years, scarcely two thousand of that people were to be found there, they amount now to upwards of forty thousand; and we can confirm his statement from other sources, that they are increasing in multitude by large annual additions. A very recent English traveller encountered many Jews on their road to Jerusalem, who invariably replied to his inquiries, that they were going thither "to die in the land of their fathers." For many years past this desire had prevailed among the Hebrews; old Sandys has recorded it in his account of Palestine; but it has been reserved for the present day to see the wish so amply gratified. A variety of motives stimulates the desire; the devout seek to be interred in the soil that they love; the superstitious, to avoid the disagreeable alternative of being rolled under the earth's surface until they arrive in that land on the great morning of the resurrection. But, whatever be the motives of a people now blinded by ignorance, who does not see, in fact, a dark similitude of the faith which animated the death-beds of the Patriarchs—of Jacob, and of Joseph, who, "when he died, made mention of the departing of the children of Israel, and gave commandment concerning his bones"? In all parts of the earth this extraordinary people, whose name and sufferings are in every nation under heaven, think and feel as one man on the great issue of their restoration—the utmost east and the utmost west, the north and the south, both small and large congregations, those who have frequent intercourse with their brethren, and those who have none, entertain alike the same hopes and fears. Dr. Wolff heard these sentiments from their lips in the remotest countries of Asia; and Buchanan asserts that wherever he went among the Jews of India, he found memorials of their expulsion from Judea, and of their belief of a return thither. At Jerusalem they purchase, as it were, one day in the year of their Mussulman rulers; and being assembled in the valley of Jehoshaphat, bewail the overthrow of their city and temple, and pray for a revival of its glory.

Though they have seen the Temple twice, and the City six times destroyed, their confidence is not abated, nor their faith gone: for 1800 years the belief has sustained them, without a king, a prophet, or a priest, through insult, poverty, torture, and death; and now in the 19th century, in the midst of "the march of intellect," and, what is better, in the far greater diffusion of the written word of God, both among Jews and Christians, we hear from all a harmonious assent to the prayer that concludes every Hebrew festival—"The year that approaches, O bring us to Jerusalem!" This belief has not been begotten and sustained by rabbinical bigotry; for although a fraction of the reformed Jews have excluded from their liturgy every petition for restoration, and even for the coming of the Messiah, yet it prevails more strongly, if possible, among the converts to Christianity. We have now before us a letter from a Hebrew proselyte, dated but a few weeks ago at Jerusalem, which the writer was visiting for the first time; his heart overflows with patriotism, and the remembrance of his ancestry; he beheld the land of his fathers, to be hereafter his; "theirs not by unholy war, nor by stratagem or treachery, but as the gift of Him who is yet to be the glory of his people Israel."

It is only within the last few years that the Jews, as a body, have been known beyond the circle of curious and abstruse readers. Their pursuits and capacities, it was supposed, were limited to stock-jobbing, money-lending, and orange stalls; but few believed them to be a people of vigorous intellect, of unrivalled diligence in study, with a long list of ancient and modern writers, whose works—though oftentimes mixed with matter, much of which is useless, and much pernicious, and calculated far more to sharpen than to enrich the understanding—bespeak most singular perseverance and ability. The emancipation of genius, which began under Moses Mendelsohn about the year 1754, brought them unlooked-for fame on the stage of profane literature;—the German, which had hitherto been regarded as an unholy language, became the favorite study of the liberalized Hebrews; thence they passed to the pursuit of the various sciences, and of every language, whether living or dead; their commentators and critics, philosophers and historians, condescended to a race with the secular Gentiles, and gave, in their success, an earnest of the fruit that their native powers could reap from a wider field of mental exertion.

That the Jews should be degraded and despised is a part of their chastisement, and the fulfilment of prophecy; but, low and abhorred as they still are, we now hail for them the dawn of a better day, a day of regeneration and deliverance, which raising them alike from neology and rabbinism, shall set them at large in the glorious liberty of the gospel. This desirable consummation, though still remote, has approached us more rapidly within the last few years. The societies at Basle, Frankfort-on-the-Maine, Berlin, Posen, and Breslau, for promoting Christianity among the Jews, have been eminently prosperous; but the London Society, the first in date, is likewise the first in its magnitude and success.

It is a very important feature in the generality of the conversions, that they have taken place among persons of cultivated understandings and literary attainments. We are not to be told that those excellent societies have operated with success on ignorance and poverty, pur-

chasing the one and persuading the other, where either necessity or incapacity lay passive before them. These Jewish converts, like their prototype St. Paul, brought up at the feet of their Gamaliels, in all the learning and wisdom of the Hebrews, now "preach the faith which once they destroyed." We have already mentioned that several have become ministers of the Church of England; on the continent we find many among the Lutheran and Reformed clergy; they have also their physicians, lawyers, head and assistant masters of the German Gymnasia; there are three professors and two lecturers, formerly Jews, in the University of Breslau; five professors in Halle; in Petersburg a professor of medicine; in Warsaw, Dr. Leo, a convert, is one of the most celebrated physicians; in Erlangen we find Dr. Stahl; and in Berlin, Dr. Neander, the celebrated church historian, fully proves that poverty of intellect is not an indispensable preliminary to Jewish conversion.

But even where the parties have not been fully brought to the belief and profession of the gospel, a mighty good has resulted from the missionary exertions. Ancient antipathies are abated, and prejudices subdued; the name of Christian is less odious to the ears of the Jew; and many of the nation, adhering still to the faith of their forefathers, ceased to uphold the Talmudical doctrine, that the Gentiles are beasts created for the purpose of administering to the necessities of Israel. They have conceived a respect for our persons, and still greater for our intellects; an ardent desire is now manifested by the Jews to hold conversation with the missionaries; along the north coast of Africa, in Palestine, and in Poland, they have visited them in crowds; and many, doubtless, have borne away with them the seed which a study of the scriptures will ripen into conviction.

As a consequence of this more friendly intercourse between Jew and Gentile, we must mention the kinder feelings entertained by the Hebrews towards a converted brother. We have heard, indeed, from the lips of a proselyte, that he had, even within the last four or five years, observed an improvement in this respect among his own relations; and the same fact is most amply attested by the opinion and experience of Mr. Herschel.

We wish we could say that this sentiment was universal; but, alas! we know many and lamentable exceptions. There are Jews in all parts of Europe who dare not avow their Christianity, so great is the fear of public reproach or domestic tyranny. In Constantinople, Tunis, and Turkey generally, where the Jews have a police, and authority over their own body, conversion is as dangerous as in Ireland itself.—Whenever a Hebrew is suspected of wavering in his rabbinical allegiance, he is imprisoned and bastinadoed; and no later than January of this year, a young man in Tunis, who had discovered an inclination to the hated faith, was assaulted so violently by his relations that "he fainted on the spot," says the missionary, "and lingered a few days, when he died." Nevertheless, conversions even there, as in Ireland, are constantly on the increase; it being still the good pleasure of God that the blood of the martyrs should be the seed of the church.

A desire, corresponding to this change of sentiment, is manifested to obtain possession of the word of God, and they eagerly demand copies of the Society's editions of the Old Testament in Hebrew. In the last

two years 5400 copies have been sold by Mr. Stockfeldt, in the Rhenish provinces; several thousands on the coast of Africa, by Mr. Ewald; and in Konigsberg, Mr. Berghfeldt sells copies to the amount of about one hundred pounds annually. In Poland and Jerusalem the missionaries can dispose of all that are sent; and the last report of the Society informs us that a less additional number than twenty thousand copies would be utterly inadequate to the demands of the Israelites in all parts of the world. It is also very observable that the translation in their vernacular dialect has excited the liveliest interest among the long neglected females of the Hebrew nation. All this indicates a prodigious change; hitherto they have cared little but for the legends of the Talmud and rabbinical preachments; they now betake themselves to the study of scripture, and will accept the Pentateuch printed and presented by the hands of Christians! This abundant diffusion of the Hebrew Bible has, more than any other cause, contributed to abate prejudice and conciliate affection.

But a more important undertaking has already been begun by the zeal and piety of those who entertain an interest for the Jewish nation. They have designed the establishment of a church at Jerusalem, if possible on Mount Zion itself, where the order of our service, and the prayers of the liturgy shall daily be set before the faithful in the Hebrew language. A considerable sum has been collected for the purpose; the missionaries are already resident on the spot; and nothing is wanting but to complete the purchase of the ground on which to erect the sacred edifice.

The growing interest manifested for these regions, the larger investment of British capital, and the confluence of British travellers and strangers from all parts of the world, have recently induced the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to station there a representative of our Sovereign, in the person of a Vice-Consul. This gentleman set sail for Alexandria at the end of last September—his residence will be fixed at Jerusalem, but his jurisdiction will extend to the whole country within the ancient limits of the Holy Land; he is thus accredited, as it were, to the former kingdom of David and the Twelve Tribes.

This appointment has been conceived and executed in the spirit of true wisdom. We have done a deed which the Jews will regard as an honor to their nation; and have thereby conciliated a body of well-wishers in every people under heaven. Throughout the East they nearly monopolize the concerns of traffic and finance, and maintain a secret but uninterrupted intercourse with their brethren in the West. Thousands visit Jerusalem in every year from all parts of the globe, and carry back to their respective bodies that intelligence which guides their conduct and influences their sympathies. So rapid and accurate is their mutual communication, that Frederick the Great confessed the earlier and superior intelligence obtained through the Jews on all affairs of moment. Napoleon knew well the value of a Hebrew alliance; and endeavored to reproduce, in the capital of France, the spectacle of the ancient Sanhedrim, which, basking in the sunshine of imperial favor, might give laws to the whole body of the Jews throughout the habitable world, and aid him, no doubt, in his audacious plans against Poland and the East. His scheme, it is true, proved abortive; for the mass of the Israelites were by no means inclined to merge their hopes in

the destinies of the Empire—exchange Zion for Montmartre, and Jerusalem for Paris. The few liberal believers whom he attracted to his views ruined his projects with the people by their impious flattery; and averted the whole body of the nation by blending, on the 15th of August, the cipher of Napoleon and Josephine with the unutterable name of Jehovah, and elevating the imperial eagle above the representation of the Ark of the Covenant. A misconception, in fact, of the character of the people, has vitiated all the attempts of various sovereigns to better their condition; they have sought to amalgamate them with the body of their subjects, not knowing, or not regarding the temper of the Hebrews, and the plain language of the scripture, that "the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations."

It is a matter for very serious reflection that the Christians themselves have cast innumerable stumbling blocks in the way of Hebrew conversion. To pass over the weak and ignorant methods that men have adopted to persuade the Jews, let us ask whether the Christians have ever afforded to this people an opportunity of testing the divine counsel, "By their fruits ye shall know them"? What is the record of the Christian periods of the second dispersion?—A history of insolence, plunder, and blood, that fills even now the heart of every thinking man with indignation and shame! Was this the religion of the true Messiah? Could this be in their eyes the fulfilment of those glorious prophecies that promised security and joy in his happy days, when his "officers should be peace and his exactors righteousness"? What, too, have they witnessed in the worship and doctrine of Christian states? The idolatry of the Greek and Latin churches, under which the Hebrews have almost universally lived, the mummeries of their ritual, and the hypocrisy of their precepts, have shocked and averted the Jewish mind. We oftentimes express our surprise at the stubborn resistance they oppose to the reception of Christianity; but Christianity in their view is synonymous with image-worship, and its doctrines with persecution; they believe that in embracing the dominant faith they must violate the two first commandments of the Decalogue, and abandon that witness, which they have nobly maintained for 1800 years, to the unity of the God of Israel.

It well imports us to have a care that we no longer persecute or mislead this once-loved nation; they are a people chastened, but not utterly cast off; "In all their affliction He was afflicted." For the oppression of this people there is no warrantee in scripture; nay, the reverse; their oppressors are menaced with stern judgments; "I am jealous for Jerusalem and for Zion with a great jealousy, and I am very sore displeased with the heathen that are at ease; for I was but a little displeased, *and they helped forward the affliction.*" This is the language of the Prophet Zachariah; and we trace in the pages of history the vestiges of this never-slumbering Providence. No sooner had England given shelter to the Jews, under Cromwell and Charles, than she started forward in a commercial career of unrivalled and uninterrupted prosperity; Holland, embracing the principles of the Reformation, threw off the yoke of Philip, opened her cities to the Hebrew people, and obtained an importance far beyond her natural advantages; while Spain, in her furious and bloody expulsion of the race, sealed her own

condemnation. "How deep a wound," says Mr. Milman, "was inflicted on the national prosperity by this act of the 'Most Christian Sovereign,' cannot easily be calculated, but it may be reckoned among the most effective causes of the decline of Spanish greatness."

SCEPTICISM.

LETTERS TO B——, A SCEPTIC—*No. V.*

BETHANY, Va., May 11th, 1839.

My dear Friend,

I AGAIN resume the pen. The subject of the mediation of Christ is to me a blissful theme: but it is obscured by many difficulties. As stated in a former letter, "it is set forth on one hand as a commercial transaction." With this view, the Saviour is represented as covenanting to purchase a definite number of the human family by giving his *own life* as an equivalent for *their lives;* as taking upon him their sins, by imputation, so as to become himself the greatest *sinner* that ever lived! This is to contradict all that the scriptures teach on this subject; for they affirm that he was "holy, harmless, and undefiled—separate from sinners;" that he was the "delight" of the Father—who says of him, "This is my beloved *son*, in whom I am well pleased."

In the same absurd way the *righteousness* of Christ is said to be imputed to believers, so that they are as really holy and just in the sight of the great Creator as if they had never sinned. This view of the subject *destroys forever* the idea of *pardon.* If I am thrown into prison for debt, and a friend interposes and pays the full amount, can there be any room for the display of grace on the part of the creditor? What would be my feelings should the creditor meet me at the door of my prison, and say, 'I now freely forgive you all the debt'? Might I not indignantly reply, 'I am, indeed, released; but I thank you not for it.'

The view also set forth in the Episcopalian Church Book, and transferred to the Methodist Discipline, that "Christ died to reconcile the Father to us," is equally absurd and unscriptural. This would put it out of our power to love the Father at all: we could in no sense feel indebted to him for salvation. But if there is a truth, written as with a *sun-beam*, in the whole volume of revelation, it is—that "*God* so loved the world as to send his only begotten Son into the world, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but have an everlasting life." Yes, he loved us, and desired our happiness and salvation; but how to forgive rebels, and yet maintain the honor and dignity of of his *government*, was the question. The death of Christ is a governmental, and not a commercial transaction. In case of treason, or rebellion, or any kind of transgression against a government, two things must be considered by the Governor with reference to pardon—1st. Is it desirable? 2d. Is it safe. With regard to the first, pardon is always *desirable* when there is manifestly a *sincere repentance* on the part of the offender; and this *repentance* will always prompt to atone, as far as

possible, for the past, and to a thorough reformation in time to come. To grant pardon without this evidence of repentance, would be to prostrate all dignity and authority in the dust, and at once to publish a universal license to sin. It would shake the deep foundations of the strongest government in the universe. But when this point is gained—when every thing conspires to make pardon desirable—the next consideration is, is it safe? I have now before me a brief sketch of the trial and execution of Dr. Dodd, for forgery, in a work entitled "The Corner Stone," by J. Abbot, the leading incidents of which are familiar to you. When he was in prison, Dr. Johnson, the great English philogist, penned a letter for him, addressed to the King, of which the following is an extract:—"I confess the crime, and own the enormity of its consequences, and the danger of its example! Nor have I the the confidence to petition for impunity; but humbly hope that *public security* may be established, without the spectacle of a Clergyman dragged through the streets to a death of infamy, amidst the derision of the profligate and the profane; and that justice may be satisfied with irrevocable exile, perpetual disgrace, and hopeless penury." In this case every thing combined to make pardon desirable. If a pecuniary consideration could have saved the man, hundreds of thousands could have been raised in an hour. Public sympathy was strong in his favor. But England was a *commercial* nation: her safety and prosperity depended upon the confidence reposed in written bonds. It would not do to make light of forgery. The King and the Judges decided that neither pardon nor commutation of the sentence would be safe. To apply this subject, in the words of Mr. Abbot: "What this poor sufferer's learned and eloquent advocate failed to find for him, Jesus Christ our Saviour has succeeded in finding for us—a way by which to satisfy justice and sustain law, and make a moral impression, which should arrest the sad consequences of guilt, and render it *safe* that we should be *forgiven*." Or, in the words of the Apostle, "For all having sinned and come short of the glory of God, are justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is by Christ Jesus; whom God has set forth a propitiatory (or mercy seat) through faith in his blood, for a demonstration of his own justice in passing by the sins which were before committed through the forbearance of God: for a demonstration, also, of justice in the present time, in order that he may be *just* when *justifying* him who is of the faith of Jesus." It is thus that the Creator displays his *love*, and at the same time maintains the inflexibility of his justice and the dignity of his government.

It is related of one of the ancient kings that he once passed an edict that for a certain offence the transgressor should suffer the loss of both his eyes. But his own son was the first offender. What was to be done? His character and government must not be rendered contemptible by favoritism. But love and justice harmonize. He inflicts half the punishment on himself, and half on his son; and thus shows his unyielding adherence to principle. While on this subject, the mediation of Christ, I cannot omit to speak of the *person* of the Mediator. All the circumstances of the case require that an *illustrious* personage should interpose: it is necessary for the dignity of the divine government—it is necessary in order to show the heinous nature of sin: and last, but not least, it is necessary to show the greatness of the divine

love for us. And here I beg leave to introduce an illustration from the writings of Andrew Fuller, quoted by Asa Shinn, in an admirable and excellent work of his, entitled "An Essay on the Plan of Salvation." Page 178 he says, "The sense of mankind, with regard to the necessity of a Mediator, may be illustrated by the following similitude:—Let us suppose a division in the army of one of the wisest and best of kings, through the evil counsel of a foreign enemy, to have been disaffected to his government; and that without any provocation on his part, they traitorously conspired against his crown and life. The attempt failed; and the offenders were seized, disarmed, tried by the laws of their country, and condemned to die. A respite, however, was granted them during his Majesty's pleasure. At this solemn period, while every part of the army and of the empire was expecting the fatal order for execution, *the king was employed in meditating mercy.* But how could mercy be shown? "To make *light* of a conspiracy," said he to his friends, "*would loosen the bands of government: other divisions of the army might be tempted to follow their example;* and the nation at large might be in danger of imputing it to tameness, fear, or some unworthy motive."

"Every one felt in this case the necessity of a mediator, and agreed as to the general line of conduct proper for him to pursue. 'He must not attempt,' said they, 'to compromise the differences by dividing the blame: that would make things worse. He must justify the king, and condemn the outrage committed against him; he must offer, if possible, some honorable expedient, by means of which the bestowment of pardon *shall not relax, but strengthen just authority;* he must convince the conspirators of their crime, and introduce them in the character of supplicants; and mercy must be shown them out of respect to him or for his sake.

"But who could be found to mediate in such a cause? This was an important question. A work of this kind, it was allowed on all hands, required singular qualifications.

"He must be perfectly clear of any participation in the offence,' said one, 'or inclination to favor it."

"He must,' said another, 'be one who, on account of his character and services, stands high in the esteem of the king and the public: a mediator in effect pledges his honor *that no evil will result to the state from the granting of his request.*"

"I conceive it is necessary,' said a third, 'that the welght of the mediation should bear a proportion to the magnitude of the crime, and to the value of the favor requested; and that for this end it is proper he should be a person of *great dignity.*'

"A fourth remarked that he must possess a *tender compassion* towards the unhappy offenders, or he would not cordially interest himself in their behalf.

"Finally, it was suggested by a fifth, that 'for the greater fitness of the proceeding, it would be proper that some relation or connexion should subsist between the parties.

"Meanwhile the king and his son, whom he greatly loved, and whom he had appointed generalissimo of all his forces, had retired from the company, and were conversing about the matter, which attracted the general attention.

"My son, said the benevolent sovereign, what can be done in behalf of these unhappy men? To order them for execution, violates every feeling of my heart; yet to pardon them is dangerous. If mercy be exercised, it must be through a mediator; and who is qualified to mediate in such a cause? and what expedient can be devised by means of which *pardon* shall not *relax*, but *strengthen* just authority: speak, my son, and say what measures can be pursued.'

"My father,' said the prince, 'I feel the insult offered to your person and government, and the *injury* thereby aimed at the *empire at large*. They deserve to die without mercy. Yet I feel for them. I cannot endure to witness their execution. What shall I say? On me be this wrong! Let me suffer in their stead. Inflict on me *as much as is necessary to impress the army and the nation with a just sense of the evil, and of the importance of good order and faithful allegiance*. Let it be in their presence, and in the presence of *all assembled*. When this is done, let them be permitted to implore and receive your Majesty's *pardon* in my name. If any man refuse so to implore, and so to receive it, let him die the death.'

"My son!' replied the King, 'you have expressed my heart! The same things have occupied my mind; but it was my desire that you should be voluntary in the undertaking. It shall be as you have said. The dignity of your person and character will render the sufferings of *an hour* of greater account *as to the impression of the public mind*, than if all the rebellious had been executed; and by how much I am known to have loved you, by so much will *my compassion to them*, and *my displeasuee against their wicked conduct be made manifest*.'

"The gracious design being communicated at court, all were struck with it. The only difficulty that was started was amongst the judges of the realm. They at first questioned whether the proceeding was admissible. 'The law,' said they, 'makes provision for the transfer of debts, but not of crimes. Its language is, The soul that sinneth it shall die.' But when they came to view things on a *more enlarged scale*, considering it as an expedient on an extraordinary occasion, and perceiving that the spirit of the law would be preserved, *and all the ends of good government answered*, they were satisfied. 'It is not a measure,' said they, 'for which the law provides, yet it is not *contrary* to the law, but *above* it. [Goodness is more than justice.]

"The day appointed arrived. The prince appeared, and suffered as a criminal. Returning to the palace, amidst the tears and shouts of the loyal spectators, the suffering hero was embraced by his royal father, who, in addition to the natural affection which he bore to him as a son, loved him for his singular interposition at such a crisis. 'Sit thou,' said he, 'at my right hand! though the threatenings of the law be *not literally* accomplished, yet the spirit of them is preserved, the honor of *good government is secured*, and the end of punishment is more effectually answered, than if all the rebels had been sacrificed. Ask of me, my son, what I shall give thee!'

"He asked for the offenders to be introduced as supplicants at the feet of his father, for the *forgiveness* of their crimes, and for the direction of affairs till order and happiness should be perfectly restored."

But on the last point—the love of God—how do those persons degrade the love of God, who regard our Mediator and Saviour as a

created being? To again borrow *ideas* (if not language) from our friend C—, how would that divine sentence, 'God *so loved* the world that he gave his only begotten *Son*,' how would it lose its glory and sink into insignificance, were we to read it 'God so loved the world that he gave an *angel* for us!' But further still, our Almighty Creator could as *easily* create the brightest angel that glitters before his throne, as to create a beast of the field, or a fowl of the air. How, then, would it read, 'God so loved the world that he gave a fowl of heaven for our salvation'!

Hoping that you will candidly examine all these things, I bid you farewell for the present.

Affectionately your friend,

M. S. CLAPP.

GOD IS OUR FATHER.

VICKSBURG, April 29, 1839.

GOD is our Father. By him were we created; "in him we live, and move, and have our being." And what a Father! "The heavens declare his glory, and the firmament showeth forth his handy work." His works are truth, and his ways judgment. How great his signs, and how mighty his wonders! He liveth for ever and ever, whose *dominion* is an everlasting dominion, whose wisdom infinite, eternal, unchangeable. His will is done in heaven: cherubim and seraphim pay allegiance to him. The secrets of wisdom belong to him. But, O how great his goodness!—Revealed wisdom he has bestowed as a rich boon to man. Yes, that which contains eternal life, joy unspeakable, and full of glory! Man, O man! praise, exalt, adore Him, the fountain of all excellence, the source from whence emanates every good, every perfect gift.

And is it so? Aye, even so, because God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son, by which we call him Abba, Father. Then, as our Father, we are to apply to him for what we want. Whither should children go, but to their father, for protection, help, and relief in every danger, difficulty, and distress? We must trust his power and wisdom and paternal goodness to provide for us, take care of us, and do for us that which is best; and what that is, he knows best. To be anxiously fearful what will become of us, and discontented and perplexed under the apprehension of future evils, whilst we are in the hands and under the care of our Father which is in heaven, is not to act like children. Earthly parents cannot avert from their children all the calamities they fear, because their wisdom and power are limited; but one all-wise and almighty Father in heaven *can*. They may possibly want love and tenderness; but our heavenly Father cannot. As children, we must quietly acquiesce in his disposal, and not expect to see into the wisdom of all his will. It would be indecent and undutiful in a child to dispute the authority, or question the wisdom, or neglect the orders of his parents every time he could not discern the reason and design thereof. Much more unreasonable and unbecoming is such a behaviour towards God, who giveth not account of any of his matters; whose judgments

are unsearchable, and whose ways are past finding out. Lastly, as children we must patiently submit to his discipline and correction. Earthly parents may sometimes punish their children through passion, or for their pleasure; but our heavenly Father always corrects for their profit, and only if need be, and never so much as their iniquities deserve. Under his fatherly rebukes, then, let us ever be humble and submissive. Such now is the true filial disposition. Such a temper and such a behaviour should we show towards God, if we would act in character as his children. C. D. HURLBUTT.

INCIDENTS ON A TOUR TO THE SOUTH.

NO. VII.

From Louisville, Kentucky, accompanied by brother Morton, we proceeded to Shelbyville, and in a few hours found ourselves comfortably lodged under the hospitable roof of our former kind host and brother Dr. Nuckols, and his amiable consort. The church in Shelbyville we found in good health and good order, and consequently it had grown much since our last visit to that place. The best index of good health, especially in young communities, is their steady growth. Unless by emigration a church diminish, which, in this migratory population is not a very uncommon event, it is a sure sign of ill health if she long remain stationary, and still more ominous if she grow less. While, indeed, we cannot regard a very florid growth, the effect of artificial stimulants, as healthy; any more than the dropsical and bloated fulness of an obese corpulency, the effect of diseased action; we must view a diminished person and a worn and shrivelled face in youth, or middle age, as an infallible index of bad health.

Our audience in Shelbyville was large and attentive, composed of a fair representation of the clergy and laity of all the sects in the place. We delivered three discourses, and hasted on to Frankfort, where we were, as formerly, cordially received by our friend and host Mr. Langston Bacon—as good a man, not to be a Christian, as we saw in our tour.

Our good and worthy brother Taffe, formerly our fellow-traveller on our northern tour, met us at Shelbyville and increased our joy. He and brother Gates, of Louisville, a brother highly esteemed by us for almost twenty years, accompanied us through the whole state to Maysville; and brother Brown, of Indiana, as far as Lexington. Brothers Gates, of Louisville, and Brown, of Indiana, accompanied us into the interior of the state; and at Frankfort we were met by brother Fall, the first Reformer in

Kentucky; by brother Chinn, of Lexington, and the amiable and indefatigable brother Fleming. These choice spirits, ardently devoted to the cause of primitive Christianity, greatly refreshed and comforted us with their company. We were very courteously received into the Presbyterian church in Frankfort, and attentively heard by a very large and intelligent congregation. Next morning, being the Lord's day, we were carried by brother Chinn in a private carriage to Lexington, a distance of 24 miles, in time to address a large audience in the city in the forenoon. We spoke again at 3 o'clock in the University Chapel to a very large concourse, and met with the brethren in Church street to break the loaf of blessing at night. We had a pleasant time. The Senior and the Junior brother Creath was there, as zealous and indefatigable as ever, and old Father Sims and Higbie, and many more too long to tell, with whom in days we took sweet counsel together. After visiting Versailles and Georgetown, and addressing the large communities assembled in those places, we again returned to Lexington, accompanied by our beloved brother and sister Burnet, to our kind and generous host and hostess, brother and sister Hall. I cannot mention the many brethren in those places, besides brethren Nuckols, Duval, and Bullock, whose dwellings were ours while we sojourned with them—whose presence and salutations in the Lord greatly animated our zeal and lightened the fatigues of our journey. The purest joys that earth affords are in the fellowship of kindred minds touched by the magnet of redeeming love, united to Christ and his cause by the bonds of an everlasting covenant, and made joint heirs of a glorious immortality. To see the faces of such persons shining with zeal and love, inspires one with fresh ardor and encourages to renewed energies and untiring perseverance in the work of the Lord. Many such faces, long known to us, we saw in every group and congregation throughout the state. May the Lord make them like the sun in the kingdom of our Father for ever and ever!

There had been for some time certain misunderstandings and alienations in the church in Lexington, arising, as such difficulties almost always arise in churches, out of errors in discipline. Intelligent and worthy brethren, either from a want of a deep and practical knowledge of human nature, or from some mistaken view of some question involving principles of church arrangements or administrations, will suffer themselves to be for the time being wholly absorbed in one idea, as if there were not two ideas in the Christian Institution. They will, then, in showing their zeal for the Lord, as one of the olden time, run too fast; and speak harsh things, and wound feelings, and alienate affections. Then the little speck upon the skin becomes a cancer-wart, or a

leprosy, or a symptom of some mortal malady; then his company and fellowship must be eschewed like an infected city. He has his friends: he tells his tale of woes, and they sympathize with him. They think he is more than half right in theory; and then he has been much injured in fact. Thus they who listen become infected with the same spirit, and enter into his antipathies and sympathies until they become *homopathics*, and until a neucleus of discord or a schism is formed; and then the tittle-tattle of that unruly evil thing, full of deadly poison, fans the spark into a flame, and the fire rages; and, alas! there are neither engines nor fire-men in the camp who can extinguish it until it bursts through the walls and the citizens are awakened. Then the fire-bells ring; and Oh, what a noise in the streets! What a rush to the theatre of conflagration! Behold how great a pile a single spark kindles! Yet there was a moment when a single tear would have extinguished the spark, and saved the building of God from any harm.——Well, the school of experience is a dear school; and those who cannot, or do not read their Bibles, will have to take in that academy a few unpleasant lessons.

Good and intelligent men, too, like brethren Poindexter, Chinn, &c. &c. will sometimes differ upon a question of *expediency*; and, like Paul and Barnabas, get into a passion about Silas or John Mark, and walk on different sides of the street. Still we rejoice to see that the fit is not perennial; but, like the same two mighty chiefs, they can, after a while, speak of one another and treat one another as liege subjects of the common King and Prince of the affections of all good men. We set on foot a remedial system, which we rejoice to hear has been thoroughly perfected by brother Johnson—and all things are now restored—and that there has since been a number of additions made to the church in Lexington, as there was to that in Shelbyville, on the Lord's day after our visit there.

Discipline is not universally nor practically understood by the brethren. Churches are not generally set in order according to the Apostless' teaching, and it is hard for them to preserve what they have not got. Evangelists are ten times more expert in making converts than in putting things in order. "Elders that rule well" are rarer commodities in this day than Doctors of Divinity. I can find a hundred men that can preach down every *ism* in Christendom but their own, for ten that can take care of a few sheep in the wilderness. Kings, indeed, and Prophets too, are, now-a-days, more easily met than shepherds. We want discipline; yes, brethren, we want discipline. The fierce democracy of the Baptist system, and the prouder aristocracy of Presbyterianism; and the still more supercilious despotism of high

school Episcopalianism, are neither singly nor collectively the eldership nor episcopacy of Christ's monarchy. A community where all are judges—where all are heads, is a monster; and that community where all are body and no head is also a monster. The settling of a question of discipline by the casting vote of sister Anne, baptized during the last moon, is making her *Queen* Anne of the church; and the settling of a question by a unanimity of voices puts into the power of Simon, not Simon Peter, who is a little self-willed, to be the Pope of the whole church. We neither plead for the unanimity of the whole body, nor for a lean majority in cases of discipline; nor, indeed, for making the whole church a Court of Oyer and Terminer to decide such matters. But this is not the time nor place for an essay on church discipline. Of this yet more fully in another corner.

After another address to an immense audience in the University Chapel on Thursday evening, through the liberality of E. Johnson, esq. mail contractor, we were sent forward to Paris, accompanied by bro. Hall, where we had a large audience in waiting; and were animated by the presence of brethren Raines and Irvine and other fellow-laborers in the kingdom of our Lord. We had seen the amiable and zealous brother Gano at Georgetown, and most of those who labor in the word and teaching; but so rapid was our march through the state, that we had but little time for conversation. After sojourning during the night with our amiable and faithful brother Williams, superadded to our company our old friend and host brother Briant, we posted on to May's Lick; and on arriving were immediately carried to the hospitable residence of our faithful and devoted brother Sandidge.

On Lord's day the large meeting-house owned in copartnary by the Baptists and the Disciples of Christ—(a bad arrangement!)—being that day in the occupancy of the Baptists, we were kindly permitted to occupy it on condition that we should not begin to speak for some two hours after the Baptist Minister ended: so that the sound and uncorrupt Baptists might have time to digest their two-weekly meal of orthodoxy, or escape the infected atmosphere of our breath without the danger of contamination. The gift of the house was like the surrender of a city—on condition that time be allowed for all the inhabitants who did not like the capitulation, to evacuate its walls! By this courtesy a large congregation was kept in waiting till between 2 and 3 o'clock, which, but for the condition, might have heard both discourses against that hour, and been on their way home.

We had the satisfaction of hearing the preacher, who, much to our edification, quoted several passages from a Bible we had never seen. One remarkable fact, to us entirely new, was a

statement quoted concerning certain monuments erected in the Red Sea, in commemoration of the safe passage of the Israelites. The preacher seemed peculiarly conversant with the new Bible; for he quoted it more frequently and more fluently than the commonly received text. It is a lamentable fact, that many preachers are more conversant with Clarke, and Fuller, and Dwight, than with the writings of Moses and the Apostles.

From May's Lick we hasted to Maysville, and filled our last appointment in the specified time. In addition to our appointments, at the request of the Maysville Lyceum, we gave them, the same evening, an extemporaneous address in the Methodist meeting house, on the subject of Supernatural Facts. Thus in fourteen days we passed from Louisville to Maysville, and spoke fifteen times to very large assemblies. From the residence of Judge Reid, one of my first acquaintances in the state, who, deeply impressed in favor of Christianity during the M'Calla debate in 1823, was some years afterwards immersed into the faith of Christ, in less than an hour after my address to the Lyceum we were safely aboard a steam-boat, in which we had a comfortable passage to Wellsburg, Virginia. On the evening of the same day, March 28th, we safely arrived at Bethany, and through the kind providence of our heavenly Father, to whom be everlasting gratitude! we found all things well—our immediate household enjoying health, peace, and competence.

Thus ended a tour of six months, lacking a few days, in which we passed over more than five thousand miles in our meanderings through the states of Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Kentucky. We spoke almost once for every day, and were all the time in a current of human beings, incessantly in conversation. Though often in apparently imminent peril on land and sea, on mountains and rivers, by night and day, in the public stages, rail-cars, and steamboats, we suffered not the slightest injury nor accident. We found many friends and some brethren every where, and succeeded mainly in the great object of our tour, which was not that of immediate proselytism; for not more than about forty confessions were made in our presence during the journey: our great object being similar to that of our first tours in Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Kentucky—that of dispossessing the demons of prejudice, and propitiating an impartial and candid hearing of our whole pleadings with this generation.

We learned much of the actual conditions of society in the South, as we had before by travelling in the North; and hope to make these acquisitions available to the advantage of our readers.

On a survey of all that we saw and heard on the whole subject of religion and morality—both theory and practice—we must

say, that much is wanting, very much is wanting in order to correct and scriptural views of the gospel and its institutions; and still more in order to moral and Christian excellence of character before God and man. This is truly a degenerate age, as respects Christian purity and Christian enjoyment. There is, too, every where more of a readiness to reform the creed than the life—to correct errors of opinion and theory, than errors of the heart—to rectify the understanding, rather than the affections, and to exhibit sound tenets, rather than godly lives—good works are much more wanting than good notions—devotion to the Lord, more than submission to a party—personal and family religion, more than plans and benevolent operations on paper for the Asiatics and Africans.

What a singular phrenzy is a religious zeal without knowledge. To see persons making large donations, outfits, and arrangements for missionary operations to the isles that are afar off; while their own children and servants on their plantations are as far from the kingdom of heaven as the Arabians; so far as Christian faith, or piety, or moral excellence is concerned. To what, but a species of monomaniacism, can we ascribe those mighty efforts to convert Pagans in Africa, while Africans in America are as ignorant of the way of life, as were their ancestors at home a thousand years ago! We talk about translations of the Scriptures into foreign languages for the benefit of foreign savages, while we have millions of our population that can read and understand the Hebrew Bible as well as the King's English! O, you Christian Fathers, and you Christian Masters! what will you say for yourselves when the wretched fate of your own household shall be traced to your neglect of duty; to your avarice, your pride, your devotion to public opinion, or supreme indifference to the final destinies of those whose eternal fortunes the God of all flesh has entrusted in a great measure to your care! Awaken, I pray you, to your responsibilities, and think not that your hundreds or your thousands contributed to schools and colleges, and missions, and education associations—all of which may be both lawful, expedient, and useful in their own places—will justify your neglect of duty at home to those who have larger and stronger claims upon your liberality, or avert the vials of divine indignation hanging over the heads of those that practically deny the faith, in not providing for the intellectual and moral, as well as the physical wants of their households!

The piety of this generation, with but a few exceptions, does not fill my ideas of Christian devotion. The fear of God, reverence for his authority, consecration to his will—prayerfulness, constant prayerfulness of temper—savory and gracious conversation—attention to the wants of God's other children—liberality

of feeling, liberality in the way of benevolent contribution, liberality as respects those who labor for the Lord at home and abroad —care for orphans and widows, care for the ignorant and uneducated—those sacrifices with which God is so well pleased, are comparatively greatly deficient amongst all parties. Millions are consumed upon the lusts of men for thousands that are laid up in deposite in the Bank of Heaven. But time fails. I must speak of this hereafter. "O Lord, revive thy work; in the midst of the years, in the midst of the years make known: in wrath remember mercy"! A. C.

THE GOSPEL—*No. IV.*

"Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the GOSPEL which I preached unto you, which also you have received, and wherein ye stand: by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, *how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures.*" 1 COR. xv. 1—4.

AND is it then the gospel that Christ died for our sins, was buried and rose again? Have these few simple facts constituted the hope of the ancients and the joy of the moderns; the inspiration of the prophet and the fortitude of the martyr? Are these the theme of seraphic and cherubic song, and the power of God himself to the salvation of the world? Can it be that an annunciation so brief, and apparently so simple, has already wrought such important changes in the affairs of men, and is yet to exert so predominant an influence in the accomplishment of human destiny?—that the same truth which is the solace of the solitary wanderer, is to operate upon the entire mass of the human family? So Paul affirms, and both history and prophecy confirm his declaration.

Nor need we be surprised that so great effects are to be produced by means so simple. This only proves the perfection of the instrument, and is perfectly in accordance with the divine procedure in other cases. To combine simplicity and power is regarded as a manifestation of consummate skill. No one is rewarded for making a machine more complicated. Every improver aims to produce the same or a greater effect by a more simple mechanism. The very simplicity, then, of the gospel, is but an additional evidence of its divine origin.

It is also in harmony with other exhibitions of the wisdom and power of God. In the economy of nature, for instance, there is nothing more common than the accomplishment of the greatest purposes by the simplest means; nor is there any thing more familiar than the ready applicability to particular and minor things of principles and powers which

are capable of exercising supreme and universal control. It is the same pervading influence, the attraction of gravitation, which brings to the ground a sere and yellow leaf from the oak, or the blazing meteor from heaven, and sustains in their orbits the immense planetary bodies, with their satellites. It is the same power, the attraction of cohesion, which moulds the dew-drop, which, poised upon a slender blade of grass, and touched by the sun's first rays, appears bright and beautiful as the diamond or pearl—'a gem of purest ray serene;' and lifts to the clouds the rocky precipice where the eagle builds her eyrie, and against whose base the waves of ocean rage in vain. It is not strange, then, that the same Divine Mechanician should in the religious and moral world endow the simplest means with power to accomplish the greatest ends, and to act with the same facility upon individuals and upon nations—upon one and upon all.

But again: it will be evident that the gospel must be of necessity something very simple, when it is recollected that it is to be preached to every creature. The great majority of the human race are ignorant and debased, slow of apprehension, and feeble in their capacity. The gospel is designed to open their blinded eyes, to turn them from darkness to light, to inform the understanding and to move the heart. That it has accomplished this purpose wherever it has been faithfully exhibited, and that the present civilization and refinement of the nations is mainly owing to its influence, is admitted by the best informed. Being then suited to the comprehension of all—the European, the Indian, the Negro, and the rude Barbarian, it cannot be any thing abstruse or remote, but must necessarily be easily perceived, understood, and felt. Could we indeed suppose for one moment that this divine and glorious gospel had transformed itself into those ponderous and complicated bodies of divinity which life will scarce afford time to read, or eternity to understand, we might well despair of our own salvation and the conversion of the world. Alas! how weak is man's power, and how foolish his wisdom, when compared with the omnipotence and omniscience of Jehovah. It is in his grasp that the simple and beautiful creations of God perish, and he would fain substitute his own awkward and complicated contrivances. It is in his impure vessel that the waters of the sparkling fountain lose their clearness and refreshing coolness, but all his art is insufficient to purify and restore them!

How different might now have been the state of the world if the gospel in its simplicity had been exhibited to mankind since the days of the Apostles! And to what a speedy termination it would bring the discords, feuds, and party jealousies of Christendom, if all would confine themselves to the joyful tidings that Christ has died for our

sins according to the scriptures, that he was buried, and that he rose the third day according to the scriptures! These are facts, not opinions or speculations. These are easily proved, readily understood, and quickly felt. 'And by these also we are saved,' says our Apostle, 'if we keep them in remembrance.' R. R.

MORALITY OF CHRISTIANS—*No. XV.*

There are many callings in society which are exceedingly inimical to, if not actually and positively subversive of, the morality of the gospel. In fact, there are some callings in which success depends chiefly, if not wholly, upon immoral action. Such, for example, as the manufacture of the stiletto, dirk, Bowie knife, and other instruments of assassination, of private and individual murder and vengeance. Something may be said in favor of the armor of national defence; but nothing can be said in favor of those weapons made for personal and private combat and vengeance, and which are to be carried and worn in secret. The soldier—yes, the gallant soldier carries upon his person, openly and visibly, his armor, the instruments and the insigniaof his profession; but none but the assassin, the private aggressor, the coward, or some thoughtless swain, wears on his person those weapons of private and personal aggression or defence. The maker and the vender of such barbarous and savage instruments surely cannot pray for a blessing upon their labors and profession. They cannot pray for a time when men shall follow peace with all men, and holiness, without both of which no man can be saved. They cannot pray to be delivered from all evil, or to be guarded from the appearance of it, or not to be abandoned to temptation: for such petitions would be almost tantamount to praying for their daily bread not to be given them.

This is equally pertinent to the manufacturers, distillers, and retailers of ardent spirits, especially of such articles as are chiefly used for the daily consumption of that class of intemperate persons which are in all countries the most grievous ulcers on the body politic. How, need I ask, could a Christian in the present day, when the influences of these callings are made manifest to all men, lift up his eyes to heaven, and in the presence of his God and his own household, say in the words of the saints of another age, "Bless, O Lord, the work of my hands:" "the labor of our hands, O Lord, do thou establish it!" Could such a one ask for his daily bread without implying success in his calling? And is not praying for success in that calling, praying for

the poverty, distress, and ruin of his customers—for the widowhood and orphanage of his neighbor's wife and family!

'But,' said a distiller once to me, 'sir, I do not manufacture ardent spirits to kill or ruin any one; nor do I know of any one ruined by my distillery.' 'Well, sir,' was the reply, 'what your intentions are, or what your knowledge of the effects of your profession may be, I do not need to know to convict you of the immorality of your calling. I only ask you to concede to me that other distillers may tell your story of themselves with as much truth and evidence as you tell it. Substantially, at least, you do admit it. Well, then, this at least simplifies the problem, and makes the solution more easy. There are, for example, ten thousand distilleries in the United States, and the number of persons annually destroyed by the articles manufactured are at least *thirty thousand*, one-third of whom are husbands and heads of families; besides many who are greatly injured, though not absolutely ruined by the use of your merchandize.

'Now, sir, not one of these distillers in a hundred will, or can admit to you, that his distillery is chargeable with any proportion of this vice, calamity, and ruin. Like you, they say, 'We do not vend it to the consumers, but to the retailers—we keep no tipplers nor drunkards about our premises.' No, indeed, that would neither be their interest nor their honor! They are wholesale venders of the article; and, of course, they only furnish the retailers with the poison. Well, sir, *if you did not make it, they could not buy it;* and so endeth the first chapter.

'But you do not follow every barrel you have made and sold, to see the last drop of it consumed; and therefore you cannot tell how many may have been ruined by it. God alone, in the final judgment, may show you the full amount of vice, immorality, crime, and murder chargeable to your individual account. But, till then, we are obliged to divide equally among you ten thousand distillers, thirty thousand annually ruined by your profession; and that gives to you, sir, three murders per annum—the head of one family and two unmarried persons. These, sir, are ruined by your daily business, in which Paul commands you to be diligent; saying, "Be diligent in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord." But Paul, you say, did not mean your business. Well, then, that is pronouncing judgment against yourself. It is saying that your business is unlawful—a business in which you cannot be fervent in spirit, serving the Lord.

'Still you shuffle the matter upon the shoulders of the retailers, who measure out and wait upon the drunkard and suicidal wretch, as their daily and regular calling. You say these are public nuisances. These

men cannot possibly fear God, or believe in his Son. How could they have their ears filled all the day long with cursings and blasphemies? They live upon the rankest vices of apostate wretches. They fatten upon the very carrion of iniquity. The breath which they inhale is impregnated with the grossest obscenities and profanities. The bread which they eat is the free-will offerings of the priests of Satan. They drink the libations of Bacchus, and tithe the sacrifices of demons. They draw their maintenance from the gates of hell.

'Admit all you say of those dram-sellers—those pests of every community; still if you did not furnish the article, they could not sell it. You are the cistern of their iniquities—the reservoir of all their crime, infamy, and ruin. They are but the streams that flow from your wells of pollution and death. They do but facilitate your operations and make lucrative your labors. Think, I pray you, how many tears of anguish you have bottled up for the widow; how many curses you have distilled for the orphan! Think of the lava of iniquity which belches forth from the many volcanoes of moral desolation which you have kindled by the fire of Tophet; and wash you and make you clean from this most ruinous of all the devices of Satan, of all the pursuits and callings of sin-crazed mortal man!' So readeth the second chapter. The third at a more convenient season. A. C.

CHRISTIANITY AN ORIGINAL INSTITUTION.

No. I.

The Christian Institution differs essentially from every other known amongst men, on account of its universal adaptation to our wants and circumstances. Unlike the preceding institution, which conferred its blessings upon the descendants of a single family; or the false and corrupt religions of Polytheism, confined to the members of their caste, and the creatures of a peculiar age and country; and, like the green scum that grows upon the surface of the polluted pool, or the vapor that exhales therefrom, these institutions were the legitimate offspring of ignorance and of a depraved public sentiment: the manners and morals, and politics of the state, originated and perfected them. But Christianity was not the creature of the age, nor of the country in which it was first published, it bears upon its face the least resemblance to any thing which then existed. The beautiful and sublime features which she wears had no prototype on earth; the state of private and public morals could afford no model upon which so perfect a system as this is could have been formed—no mould into which it could have been cast. It was a plant by no means indigenous to the soil in which it grew; it was an exotic; its seed was wafted upon the breath of heaven from the celestial world; and while its leaves were for the healing of the nations, its fruit administered life and immortality to those who eat of it. The entire and absolute originality of the Christian religion is

a strong and convincing proof of its divinity: as well might we expect to find the variegated beauties of the garden of Eden growing upon the glassy mirror of the ocean, or the fruits and flowers of Paradise upon the burning sands of Arabia Deserta, as to expect such an institution as that of Christianity appearing as the natural and spontaneous product of the times in which it originated. The laws and institutions of Sparta, the statutes of the inexorable Lycurgus, were nothing more than the spirit of the age embodied and made tangible; they were but "the types and the interpreters" of the times: this distinguished lawgiver cannot claim even the merit of originality. But it was not so with Christianity: this was the work of a mind untaught by human wisdom, unschooled in the religion or philosophy of the times, unaided by the sages or the learned of antiquity; a religion unique and perfect, the product of Him in whom all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge had been laid up. But although such was the origin of this wonderful system, and such the character of the age which gave it birth, yet it anticipated all the future, it saw and made ample provision for a better day, a more enlightened and perfect state of society than that which the world had ever seen; and its expectations have not been disappointed; the gospel of Christ has realized the most triumphant success in the fairest and best portions of the globe in Europe and America; and so far as the English language is spoken and English literature is known, the Christian religion is believed and valued as the wisdom and power of God for the salvation of men. After Europe arose, as from the sleep of ages; and the ancient literature of Greece and Rome were disinterred; and the scriptures of truth were brought to light and disseminated among the people; and the hateful aspect of the Papal Beast was exposed to the view of the astonished world; and the false systems of philosophy which had kept the mind in abeyance for two thousand years, was openly attacked and finally exploded; and the art of printing and the mariner's compass were discovered; and the magnificent revelation of a new world burst upon the sight in the western hemisphere; and Bacon began to develope the true foundation of all science, as originating in facts and observations, and that we know nothing "of the order of nature—*quantum re vel mente observa verit.*" This was a perilous day for the Christian religion; this was the day of her trial—not by the fires of persecution simply, but the more searching elements of reason and intellection—not by the physical arm of power and authority, but by the giant, the almost superhuman energies of the disenthralled mind of man: every thing in science, in morals, in philosophy, in politics, in religion that could be shaken, was shaken; there was a great earthquake; and a third part of all that genius, and learning, and the accumulated ages of the past had gathered together, was thrown along the ground an utter ruin. And did Christianity pass by unnoticed? By no means. She was subjected to the most careful and rigid scrutiny; she was put upon the rack, and tortured to apostatize from her allegiance to the God of heaven; and she spoke, but it was not in the accents of servility or remonstrance; she asked for no pity; she entreated for no favor; but she raised her voice, and said, "I am all divine! My nature is immortal!" She spoke in the commanding voice of authority and in the uncompromising language of truth, and the day of her trial was the day of her triumph. J. C.

WESTERN NEW YORK, May, 1839.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

Brother Campbell,

I HAVE, during the past winter and the present spring, travelled considerably in this section of the country; and having had opportunities much better than "a looker-on in Venice," I have come quite satisfactorily to the conclusion that we live on the eve of a revolution in the religious polities in this state. The public mind is on the *qua via.* "Men are running to and fro, and knowledge is increasing." The *loyale* to the sects are becoming desperate. The people of "sober second thought" are retiring. The leaders and the led of all parties are growing into an untempered compact of lordship and vassalage. But, as Lord Byron said upon another occasion—

> "This cannot endure, nor be endured;
> Mankind have felt their strength, and made it felt."

To meet the exigencies the sects are active. Their conclaves are rife with projects. They are alarmed for their titles. There are older deeds upon record than theirs. The cry is sounding from all quarters, "What shall be done?" There is but one party among the sects, of which I have any knowledge, that is on the proper road to the emancipation of themselves and their fellows, which is the party known as *Unionists.* These have moved discreetly and correctly as far as they have gone; and must not be opposed nor anticipated. They have some distance yet to sail; but their compass is true. We must with them strike a truce, and offer our assistance to help to trim and row the ship. They are afraid of pilot boats; and they have cause to be, for they found themselves under such guide, hard upon the breakers, the foam and roar of which are yet in sight and hearing. I said their compass was true; and they know it. I was almost sorry to see a boat with the pilot's flag, in the last two Harbingers, although we know the pilot to be one of the most skilful. There are many of the Baptists here who have almost the truth. In the Genesee Association they are probably more advanced than any other. They are much more so than any of their western brethren of Pennsylvania, Virginia, or Ohio, with whom I am acquainted. They have not the "Philadelphia Platform." Every church is independent of all others. So far, so good. Still more—they plead for all the items in the proclamation of the gospel, with their proper definitions. Yet I have somewhat against them: they seem not to have yet learned that "ORDER IS THE FIRST LAW OF HEAVEN." They lack the arrangement.

So much have we of a redeeming nature. But that of which I am more apprehensive than of any other means of opposition to the truth in this country is this, that, to meet the present time, prophesied by John, Rev. xix. 11. &c. by the "white horse and rider," the sects are about to follow in track of the Mormons, by adopting the Saviour's method of enlisting, and then convert them to their several parties afterwards. You know they all have one way of enlisting now, and they certainly can do as well with any other one way. The thing has been proposed by one of the sects, in this way, that they would unite with us, *only requiring the adoption of their name.* The *ruse* did not take; and I

trust there is sufficient intelligence among the disciples not to act the part of "seven women." I therefore say we must be prepared to meet this attempt on the purity of the gospel and its institutes. There is no doubt but this is in process of maturing in other places as well as here; and I believe the only way to prevent it is to be prepared to meet it.

Yours in the gospel, A. P. J.

YOURSELF.

VICKSBURG, April 17, 1839.

Beloved Brother,

"SEIZE upon truth where'er 'tis found" is a noble maxim. In every department of literature we often meet with observations, just and striking, calculated to arrest the attention and leave a profitable impression.

The following remarks on "Concerning Yourself" met my eye in the "National Intelligencer," originally from the "Pennsylvanian:"—

"You cannot find a more companionable person than yourself, if proper attention be paid to the individual. Yourself will go with you wherever you like, and come away when you please; approve your jokes, assent to your propositions, and, in short, be every way agreeable, if you only learn and practise the true art of being really "on good terms with yourself." This, however, is not so easy as many imagine who do not often try the experiment. Yourself, when it catches you in company with no other person, is apt to be a severe critic on your faults and foibles; and when you are censured by yourself, it is generally the severest and most intolerable species of reproof. It is on this account that you are often afraid of yourself, and seek any associates, no matter how inferior, whose bold chat may keep yourself from playing the censor. Yourself is likewise a jealous friend. If neglected and slighted it becomes a "bore," and to be left for even a short time "by yourself" is then regarded as actually a cruel penance, as many find when youth, health, or wealth has departed. How important is it, then, to know thyself, to cultivate thyself, to respect thyself, to love thyself warmly, but rationally. A sensible self is the best of guides; for few commit errors but in broad disregard of its admonitions. It tugs continually at the skirts of men to draw them from their cherished vices. It holds up its shadowy finger in warning when you go astray, and it sermonizes sharply on your sins after they have been committed.

"Our nature is two-fold, and its noblest part is the self to which we refer. It stands on the alert to check the excess of the animal impulses; and though it becomes weaker in the fulfilment of its task by repeated disappointments, it is rarely so enfeebled as to be unable to rise up occasionally, sheeted and pale, like Richard's victims, to overwhelm the offender with bitterest reproaches. Study, therefore, to be on good terms with yourself—it is happiness to be *truly* pleased with yourself. Pleasures and successes cannot compensate for the loss of this good understanding and amicable relationship between the parties who occupy "the house you live in."

"One *self-approving* hour whole years outweighs
Of stupid starers and of loud huzzas."

Prove and try yourselves. What manner of spirit possesses you? Is it that approved by the searcher of all hearts, to whose eyes all things are naked and open? Ignorance on this point is not uncommon. Remember David. '*Thou* art the man,' however, removed the blindness, dissipated the mists of self-deception, and awoke him to an acquaintance with HIMSELF."

Yours in the King of Kings,

C. D. HURLBUTT.

JUSTICE AND EQUITY.

JAMESTOWN, O., 16th April, 1839.

Dear brother Campbell,

I HAVE been a tolerably close observer of matters and things *en passant* through life, and among other things I have observed that some men support religion just as long as religion supports them; others profess religion as long as it costs them nothing, and abandon it as soon as a draft is made on their purses for building meeting-houses, or sustaining preachers, or entertaining strangers, and in general the burden has to be borne by a few in every congregation. Now those upon whom the burden falls ought not to complain, for they are the only ones that will be prepared for settlement when the Lord comes—they are the only ones that can give an account of their stewardship.

But the man who values religion on account of the support he derives from it, and the man who considers it worth nothing, are both at fault; and such men will be found without a passport when they come to pass the strait gate. The only passport that can be depended on must read as follows:—"I was hungry, and you gave me food; I was thirsty, and you gave me drink; I was naked, and you clothed me; I was sick and in prison, and you visited me; I was a stranger, and you entertained me," &c. These things you have done to my disciples, which is the same thing as though you had done them to me.

The foregoing is the substance of the passport which men should obtain in order to pass through the strait gate, which leads to life eternal. How foolish men will look who approach the gate without the passport; they will be like the foolish virgins, who had lamps, but no oil in them, at the hour of midnight, when the bridegroom came.

The fact is, that religion has been made to consist too much of theory, and too little of practice. There is too much said about *heart-felt* religion, and too little about practical religion. The best proof a man can give of his religion is by his works; this is the way the Apostle John recommended, and with him no religion would pass as pure and undefiled but that which relieved the distresses of fatherless children and widows.

But when I began to write, I intended to say, that at meetings which last two or three days or more, I am of opinion that a table should be spread at the common expense; or, in other words, that the expense should be defrayed out of the treasury, and that while thus worshipping we should have all things common—I mean all that we eat and drink during the time. Does not Paul hint at something like this in one of

his letters to the Corinthians? and was not this the practice of the Jerusalem church while they continued to worship from day to day? They held the longest *protracted* meeting, perhaps, that has ever been held in any place, and during the whole time they had all things common; but after the meeting broke up we have no proof that the common stock continued. For afterwards we read of *poor saints* in Jerusalem, which could not have been the case had all things remained common among them. All must have been poor alike, or else there could have been none poor.

You may improve on this hint to any extent you may think proper.

Affectionately yours,

M. WINANS.

THE RIGHTS OF PREACHERS AND OF CHURCHES TO REFUSE APPLICANTS.

"THE right of refusing baptism to a candidate, and of membership to an applicant, in any case, has been disputed on the ground of consistent theory or of scripture precedent, by some persons strongly prepossessed in favor of primitive Christianity. 'Christ,' say they, 'bids *all* to come to him, and refuses no applicant, although of previous bad character; and the apostolic churches received all immersed persons without inquiry into their former behaviour. Peter received the Pentecostian converts and Simon Magus, and Ananias received Saul of Tarsus.' What say you, Mr. Editor?"

If there be no right of refusal there is no right of choice: for he that dare not refuse, in any case, an applicant for immersion, has no choice, and consequently needs to exercise no judgment in the matter; he ought to baptize all applicants without question or demur, whether they be drunk or sober, sincere or hypocritical—of good or bad report. This savors, on the first blush, of an absurd ultraism; and yet I have known some zealous theorists take this ground. But it has neither apostolic theory nor practice to sustain it. Where, let me ask, is the scriptural precept or precedent for such a course?

Our Saviour himself refused a very moral rich young man the honor of discipleship by propounding a condition which he well knew he would not accept. The young man went away sorrowful, too; but did not accept the condition. Many are even said to have believed in him, to whom he would not commit himself by taking them into his company: so that he did not receive all applicants.

John the Baptist also refused applicants to his baptism, on the ground of insincere repentance; and when Saul attempted to join the disciples in Jerusalem, they would not receive him on his professed reformation, without other testimony than his own, which he fortunately found in the excellent Barnabas.

It is, then, not the fact, that the New Testament authorizes either the

preacher or the church to receive every person who demands the ordinances of Christ. There must always be an exemption from suspicion on the part of the candidate, or who could *cordially receive* him as a brother in Christ ought to be received?

But it is said that publicans and harlots, and even those accused of murder and other high misdemeanors, were immediately received on profession of faith and repentance, by the Apostles themselves; and that such persons were afterwards proved to be worthy of a name and a place in the kingdom of Jesus Christ. Grant it all most cheerfully and thankfully. But what then? Did those who received them entertain any doubts of their faith, repentance, or sincerity? Aye, that is the question! Not in the least. The evidences of the worthiness or fitness of the candidates was as instantaneous and as satisfactory as their application. True, indeed, they might on both sides be mistaken. But the fact of their being sometimes mistaken only proves that they were always sincerely and fully persuaded that the candidates were worthy: for had they received them with suspicion, they could not be mistaken.

There are cases in which the evidences of unfeigned faith and repentance are so clear, that the former immoralities and wickedness of the applicant, like the shade in the picture, only heightens the conviction of the depth and genuineness of his repentance.

There is no rule in the case, like that we apply to a log of timber, to ascertain its dimensions. There are many circumstances that establish evidence which even elude definition. And hence there is always room for the good sense and discrimination of the preacher and of the community before whom candidates appear. One rule, however, is universal—there must be a freedom from suspicion; there must be such evidences of sincerity as authorize a cordial reception of the candidate: for, otherwise, there would be neither confidence nor communion.

The apprenticeship system of some sects, and the *immediateism* of others, have deceived and ruined multitudes. I have no doubt that some of our brethren are at fault on the ground of discretion and discrimination on this very point. They have made it an item of the restoration of even the lost gospel itself, that every one should be immersed *instanter*, if he only demand it; that it is a sin to refuse him in almost any case. I do *know* that much injury has actually been done, and much good apparently prevented by this revivalism mania, which has been metamorphosed into ancient gospelism. Such converts as these have been fatal to the restoration of the ancient order of things. The fever abates as soon as immersion is over, and the unhappy professor possesses no stimulus to walk in all the commandments of the Lord. We must distinguish between animal excitement and faith—between human sympathy and evangelical penitence. This is the province of the word of God in skilful hands. It divides between the *soul* and the *spirit*—the animal nature of the *soul*, and the moral feelings of the *spirit*; and, sharper than any two-edged sword, separates the joints and marrow, and detects the thoughts and intents of the heart.

I practise and teach immediate submission to the Lord, and immediate baptism to those who are enlightened and penitent—who are willing to give themselves up wholly to the Lord. Still, I do not

receive every applicant. Where grounds of suspicion present themselves I cannot conscientiously proceed. I am willing to take a man upon his word, if there be no reason to suspect his word. If there be, his word is nothing. I must cordially receive a person to baptism or into the church, or not at all.

We have the common share of the ultraism of human nature in our denomination in proportion to our numbers. We have to take some of all classes of men that present themselves; and we have greater difficulties than others. We have a multitude of free-thinkers, experimentalists, insubordinates, and restive spirits, who will take nothing upon any recommendation but their own sterling sense of the fitness of things. They reject all Popes, except Pope SELF, who is always an exception to a general rule—always honest, and almost, if not altogether, free from error. In other societies they are under officers, and creeds, and systems of discipline that lash them into silent acquiescence. We go for freedom of thought, speech, action, examination; still, I, for one, do not believe that all men are equal. Equally intelligent, learned, prudent, wise, moral, Christian, they are not. I, for one, believe that "the younger should submit to the elder" in experience, judgment, piety. I do not think that the will, caprice, intelligence, or vote of Master John, my youngest brother in the church, should balance or neutralize mine. This may be called aristocracy: if so, I am aristocratic, and I do not care who knows it.

No person ought to be introduced to a church, any more than into a family, without the consent of its members; especially if his admission should even endanger the removal of a well-tried excellent brother, or break up the communion of the brotherhood. This would be to plant "a root of bitterness" in the church, rather than pluck it out, as Paul commanded. In the name of common sense, if such a sense there be, why pluck up good thifty bearing trees out of the orchard, for the sake of making room for a young graft or yearling—of whose fruit, whether to be crab or apple, we know nothing! Does nature teach us nothing, or must we have a broad precept, or a million of narrow ones, for all cases!

Take heed of stumbling blocks, brethren! "Give no occasion of stumbling or offence to Jew or Gentile, or to the church of God"—"Let all things be done unto edification," or building up, not to pulling down—"Let all things be done decently and in order." I am sure it is neither decent nor in good order to bring an indecent person into a community to the marring of its communion, or the disparagement of the truth in the neighborhood. But God forbid that we should despise a publican or a harlot, if evidence of penitence there be found in their case. But we want in some cases fruits of repentance.

I dare not baptize a man who has been addicted to strong drink, if I smell brandy on his breath while I see the big tear starting from his eye. I will say, Sir, I wait for the effluvia of the rum to escape from the vessel, before I attempt to pour in the sweet wine of the gospel. You say you repent; but how much do you repent? Can you say that you will nerer taste the deadly poison? 'No, sir,' replies the candidate. Well then, sir, you are not penitent. Repent and be baptized.

A. C.

SHORT SERMONS ON CHRISTIAN PRACTICE.

SERMONS ON PRAYER—*No. III.*

Be patient in affliction; continue instant in prayer. Rom. xi 12. Is any man afflicted? Let him pray. James v. 13. Rejoice evermore. Pray without ceasing. 1 Thess. v. 16, 17. Pray always with all prayer and supplication in the spirit.

Two things are strongly suggested to us in these apostolic injunctions: The *occasions* and the *seasons* of prayer. *Occasions* and *seasons*, though intimately connected, and sometimes confounded, are not identical. The *occasion* is the incident that calls for any thing to be done; and the *season* is the time when it should be done.

Among the *occasions* of prayer, afflictions are most prominent and chief. "In my distress I called upon the Lord," said the royal poet. Hezekiah in his afflictions besought the Lord. Jesus himself especially prayed in the scenes of darkness and distress through which he passed. "In the days of his flesh," says Paul, "when he had offered up prayers and supplications, with strong crying and tears, to Him that was able to save him from death, and was heard because he was pious," or "in that he feared."

Prayer, indeed, is the language—the natural expression of affliction and distress. And to have a tender-hearted sympathizing friend to whom to flee in times of affliction, is a relief, a consolation not to be expressed. Hence, among the many glorious attributes and accomplishments of our High Priest, that to us most suitable and admirable in our afflictions, is, that he is "touched with a feeling of our infirmities; that he was in all these respects made like to his brethren," that he might have a proper measure of compassion upon the erring and upon the afflicted.

Griefs and sorrows, if not divided, are diminished when uttered into the ears of a kind and sympathetic friend. When participated by him, they are lessened to us. And when we come into the presence of Him who "pitieth us as a father pitieth his own dear children," the belief that "he does not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men," is an alleviation, a comfort not to be described. "We have had fathers of our flesh, who chastised us, and we gave them reverence," [thanks for it;] "shall we not, then, much more be in subjection to the Father of our spirits, and live," who only afflicts us for our good!

In all the afflictions of his people the Lord may be said to be afflicted: for, said Isaiah, "according to his mercies, and according to the multitude of his loving kindnesses, he said, Surely they are my children that will not lie: so he was their Saviour. In all their affliction he was afflicted; and the angel of his presence saved them: in his love and in his pity he redeemed them; and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old." Such now is our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Is any Christian afflicted? Then let him pray. Let him tell all his tale of woe and pour out his soul before God, who will certainly hear, and succor and relieve him: for if he does not think it good to take away the affliction, he will, at least, enable him to endure it.

But there are occasions of thanksgivings as well as of prayer. Favors received, and blessings enjoyed, call for thanksgivings. Therefore, said James, "Is any one merry? Let him sing psalms." "In every thing give thanks" is a blissful precept. We may even in

affliction thank the Lord on two accounts:—First, that he has not treated us as bastards; but as sons, in chastening us; and, in the second place, that he has mingled so many blessings amid so much less chastisement than we deserve.

There are seasons of prayers and thanksgiving as well as of petition and supplication. We may, indeed, convert particular times into occasions both of prayer and thanksgiving. We may make the morning and the evening not only the times, but the occasions of petition and of praise. "Thou shalt hear my voice in the morning," said David. "O Lord, in the morning will I direct my prayer to thee." Psalm v. 3. "I will sing of thy power; yea, I will sing of thy mercy in the morning; for thou hast been my defence and refuge in the day of trouble." Ps. lix. 16. "In the morning shall my prayer prevent thee." Ps. lxxxviii. 13.

The Jews "gathered their manna every morning;" "the priests burned incense every morning;" and the Levites were to "stand every morning to thank and praise the Lord, and likewise at even." 1 Chron. xxiii. 30. From the book of Job we learn that even under the patriarchal dispensation the good and excellent of the earth were observers of occasions and seasons in their worship of the Lord. Thus Job himself, during the seasons of festivity amongst his sons and daughters, "sent and sanctified them, and rose early in the morning and offered burnt offerings according to the number of them all. Thus did Job continually." chap. i. 5.

God's people have always been a peculiar people—not like other people. They have made many occasions and seasons of devotion. The most distinguished of them have been most distinguished in these particulars. David says, "As for me, I will call upon God, and the Lord shall save me: evening, and morning, and at noon, will I pray and cry aloud, and he shall hear my voice." Ps. lv. 17. "Daniel kneeled upon his knees three times a-day, and prayed and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime," or as his manner was. But the Apostles of Christ have taught us to pray always—to be instant in prayer—and to pray without ceasing. These expressions denote a habitual devotion, a constant communion with God.

In one word, then, we are to make all important occasions seasons of peculiar devotion; and we are to make the seasons themselves—morning, noon, and evening, occasions of prayer and thanksgiving. We are to take occasions when they occur, and to make occasions when they do not, of pouring out our hearts to God. It is not a pharisaic precision, a sanctimoniousness at times and seasons, a hypocritical exactness; but a genuine, unaffected, cordial engagedness of soul, on all important occasions, and at regular seasons, for which we plead as the import both of the precepts and examples of the Holy Book.

We need, then, to pray for "the spirit of grace and of supplication," and to cultivate a prayerful temper habitually and constantly; for, without this, it is impossible to *enjoy* Christian privileges. Our hearts cannot be kept right any other way. We cannot have confidence in God, nor in ourselves, but from living near, very near to God, in our daily and constant meditations, prayers, and thanksgivings. The stream of piety is a clear, constant, tranquil, swelling current that bears the soul nearer to the bosom of our Father and our God.

Say not, my Christian brother, you have not time for this; rather say you have not disposition. Say not this will interfere with your business of life. Time is given you for no other purpose than to be saved; that is, to be purified, sanctified, and fitted for heaven; and your daily and constant business is, "to give all diligence to make your calling and your election sure." A. C.

UNION OF CHRISTIANS—*No. II.*

"KINGSTON, May 24, 1839.

"Two or three days ago I received my Harbinger for this month, and I exceedingly rejoice to see your piece on 'Union of Christians, No. I.' I am very glad you have commenced a series on this all-important subject. And I think no reasonable person can object to your three propositions; and I will not wait for some of the great guns of the sects to second your motion—(yes, I sincerely wish they might be the first to approbate it)—but will my humble self dare to second it I beg leave here to suggest one thing by asking, Would not the word '*messengers*' be more in accordance with scripture, and the general object of your proposals, than the word '*delegates*'?

"J. J. HARVEY."

But says the new Editor of the "Christian Palladium"—

"We *cannot second* this motion. 1st. Because it is *human* policy. If the saints cannot be united on the principles, and by the policy of the 'PERFECT LAW,' the unanimous *decisions* of a '*congress*' of all the sects will never effect the work. 2d. The plan, if carried into successful operation, would not only *defeat* the object proposed, but would *annihilate* nearly, if not every, vestige of the Christian religion in the world. For there is scarcely a single point in Christian theology, which *all* the sects would *agree* to *adopt* as a principle of Christian union. Some would object to every point; and according to *this* plan, all that pertains to Christianity, against which an objection should be raised, must be renounced as '*schismatical and human.*' This would be a union *without principle!* The principles of *Christian union* were clearly revealed more than *eighteen hundred years* since: embrace them, and all will be well."

Our "Christian Palladium" does not understand my proposition, nor what is intended by *catholic* principles; for he says "there is scarcely a *single point* in Christian theology which all the sects would agree to adopt as a principle of Christian union." But he says some other crude and rash things, such as, "The plan, if carried into successful operation, would not only *defeat* the object proposed, but would *annihilate* nearly, if not every, vestige of the Christian religion," &c. How a plan carried into "*successful operation*" could work such mischief, is a point so far beyond the optics of ordinary men, that we must leave it to the more piercing intelligence and strong vision of our sage friend of the Palladium. Meanwhile, till we have time to explain ourselves more fully, we copy an old creed:—

"I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth. And in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord. Who was conceived by the Holy Spirit, born of the Virgin Mary. Suffered under Pontius Pilate; was crucified, dead, and buried; he descended into hades. The third day he rose again from the dead. He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God, the Father Almighty. From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe

in the Holy Spirit; the holy catholic church; the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body; and the life everlasting. Amen."

Here are *eleven* periods, according to the punctuation of Du Pin and the old ecclesiastic writers, Roman, Greek, and Protestant; containing some fourteen different articles or facts. Now I ask, Where is the Christian sect that does not admit these fourteen articles? Does the "Christian Palladium" deny all or any of them?

I shall leave this matter with him for reflection till the moon change.

A. C.

DISCIPLINE.

Four queries on the subject of the trials of offences propounded to us for consideration, published in the June number, demand special attention. In reply to those, and some of a kindred nature, we shall submit a few reflections.

In the first place, then, we ask, Whence originated the idea that the whole congregation must try all offences; that it must be a sort of Court of Common Pleas, a tribunal of Oyer and Terminer, to hear and decide all controversies? Certainly not from the Jewish or Christian constitution or laws. There were presidents, and rulers, and judges in every social institution that our heavenly Father set up, in every dispensation of things moral and religious amongst men. There is no statute nor law known to us, requiring all offences, whether public or private, to be tried in a public assembly. It would, indeed, make the Christian community an anomaly among all human institutions—in a point, too, where much would be always endangered and nothing gained.

The Christian community is composed of persons old and young, in years and in experience; of old men, young men, and little children in Christ Jesus—a majority of whom, like the majority of a borough, a parish, a city, or a county, are not always competent judges of either law or fact. They are not, in one word, competent judges of all questions of controversy; and of course it would be a defect in any institution to demand of all its members that which all its members seldom or ever have hitherto attained.

But perhaps the querist has not in his eye controversies amongst brethren, but simply public scandals; such as drunkenness, profanity, public folly, &c. In such cases there is nothing to be decided but the *fact*. There is, even in this case, neither wisdom nor propriety in calling a whole community together to prove a fact, or to examine an evil report against a brother. This is the duty of the elders of the church. The whole church are not *bishops*. Their official duties reach to these cases. They examine the report and collect the evidence. They ascertain the fact. The transgressor is convicted, or acquitted. If acquitted, the elders state the fact to the community and the evidence; and so the matter ends. If guilty, he repents, acknowledges his error, and professes reformation. They report the case to the church, admonish him in their presence; and so the matter ends. But he does not admit the fact, though clearly proved. They also state

the fact, the evidence, and their judgment of the affair to the community, and the community support, or do not support the decision of the presbytery or episcopate. If they do, they separate him from the community; and so the matter ends. If they do not, the bishops resign either the case or their office, and the community appoint other persons to judge the case, or to succeed them in office.

Wherever the profession has been scandalized by any public offender, he must, when convicted, be either separated from the church; or if on penitence, unequivocally expressed, he be retained, he ought, for his own sake, and for a warning to others, and for the honor of the Christian institution, to be publicly admonished, and then to be immediately restored. We have not room at present to reason the matter farther, nor to go into the display or the proof of the premises from which these conclusions are deduced.

A public reproof is a terror to evil-doers, and a praise to them that do well. Hence Paul commands those who offend against the Christian profession to be publicly reproved, that others may fear, and that the church may have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness. I agree with the querist that all such terms as "excommunication," "interdiction," and "absolution" are somewhat papistical, and not of the pure old-fashioned diction of apostolic times; and the more simple, pure, and chaste our style, the safer and the better.

To the above Queries we add the three following, recently received:—

"1st. What number of members that belong to a given place, house, or church, is required to constitute the congregation or church of that place?

"2d. Does it require the whole, or a majority of the members, to constitute the congregation to do important business?

"3d. Can a less number than a majority constitute a congregation to do important business? If so, can one-tenth of the whole number be sufficient? If so, can five do? And if so, can three do?"

Answer to Query 1*st*. A church is not two or three, but a community, else a family were a church. There is no *maximum* nor *minimum* number of persons proposed in scripture. But if we suppose *three* persons to make a church, and if one of them trespass against another, the injured person will not find two others to take with him; and if he only took one to hear the matter, and the offender will not hear him, he cannot tell it to the church—for they have all heard it. Certain it is, then, that our Lord had in his eye more than five persons when he talked of a church.

Answer to Queries 2*d and* 3*d*. It is preposterous for a minority of any community to call any of their acts, or for any other persons to regard their acts as the acts of the community. Nothing is the act of any community that is not acknowledged by that community. Hence the act of a minor part, unless *sanctioned to act for the whole*, can never be regarded as the act of the body. A. C.

CHARACTER OF SCEPTICISM.

Scepticism, so far as it is a result of the reasoning faculties, is much more rare than we think. Absolute doubt cannot constitute itself into a doctrine, without falling into an evident contradiction. Generally scepticism is not a system, though it has the form of one; but a malady of the mind. It is the infirmity of an intellect that has more subtlety than justness, more penetration than comprehensiveness, more cleverness than rigor, which, stopping at details without seizing upon the whole, succumbs to every objection without comprehending the reach of proof.—Degerando.

THE "CHRISTIAN INDEX" AT ISSUE WITH US ON A FACT CONCERNING REGENERATION.

"There is another assertion in immediate connexion with the above, for the proof of which our 'Reformer' is held responsible before an insulted, injured people. He says that the Baptists entertain a notion that men are regenerated *without the word*. this he affirms 'was the doctrine of the Baptists till very recently.' Where did Mr. C. learn this? It *is not so!* It never has been so, and the Reformer must make good the assertion or stand convicted of wilful misrepresentation. No people under heaven ever encouraged inquirers with more confidence to go the Word for direction, than have the Baptists. No people ever more fully carried out the Protestant maxim than they—*the Bible all-sufficient for the purposes of faith and practice.* Now how it can be alleged that this people hold regeneration *without the word*, is the mystery. That they do hold regeneration to be effected by the *Spirit* through the instrumentality of the word, is true; but still, this is not regeneration *without the word;* this is, giving an interesting prominency to the word; it is making it the 'sword of the Spirit,' the grand instrument of man's moral renovation; and Mr. C., after years of labor, has not been able to overturn this doctrine."

Accompanied by a few remarks quite as false in fact, disingenuous, and unkind as the above extract, this criticism and censure appeared in the "Christian Index," Georgia, June 6, 1839. I have no desire to retaliate on either the senior or junior Editor, except by putting them right according to the Christian law of kindness. But there is a ques- of *fact* concerned; and facts, with me, are stubborn things. I profess to be a matter-of-fact man. And is it possible that I falsely accused the Baptist society with teaching what they do not teach—namely, *regeneration by the Spirit without the Word*—yes, *without the Word?* An issue is now formed in fact, on a question of fact. The Millennial Harbinger says, "The Baptists, till recently, entertained a notion that persons are regenerated *without the Word.*" The Christian Index says, "'It is *not* so: it never has been so." Well, now, I say it *is* so; and we shall see where the *wilful* misrepresentation is. I now open the Regular Baptist confession, and read as follows:—"Elect infants, dying in infancy, are *regenerated* and saved by Christ *through the Spirit*, who worketh when, where, and how he pleases; so also are *all other elect persons* who are incapable of being OUTWARDLY CALLED BY THE MINISTRY OF THE WORD."* Infants and persons not outwardly addressed by the Word, are *regenerated through the Spirit?* The proof of this doctrine makes it farther evident that no Word is necessary; for, say the Baptists, "*the Spirit works when, where, and how he pleases.*" With the Word, then, or without it. Now, my friend Christian Index, show your honesty and love of truth, and free yourself from ignorance or wilful misrepresentation of your own creed or of your humble servant. Present this to your readers, and if this will not satisfy you and them, you shall have more proof. I suppose, however, your Confession of Faith is paramount authority. You wilfully misrepresent me; or *ignorantly*, perhaps, I ought more courteously to say, when you represent me as contending for regeneration without the Spirit. How long will you, my old Baptist friends, most unmercifully persecute one whose only fault to you is, that he has told you some of the truth which you knew not before. See how Mr. Lynd has refused to have this controversy ended by stereotyping his defence and mine of our

* Philadelphia edition, page 19, A. D. 1798.

respective views, and giving them to the Baptist community. He knows that the Baptists have, till recently, advocated regeneration by the Spirit alone. I am glad to find that you are ashamed of this system; but you ought to be thankful to me for dissipating this phantom, rather than for accusing me of wilful misrepresentation. I will wait to see your candor and love of truth and justice. A. C.

SPIRITUAL AGENCY.

JAMESTOWN, O., 2d June, 1839.

Dear brother Campbell,

I HAVE just closed a short lecture on a part of Paul's second epistle to the Corinthians, in which it seems to me the Apostle settles the dispute about the manner in which men are changed into the image of Jesus Christ. He uses two figures to show how the change is wrought:—1st. "You are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ; ministered by us [Apostles,] written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God." In this figure Christ is the writer; the Apostles, the pen; and the Spirit of God, the ink. All that is necessary to understand this figure, is to put the gospel ministered by the Apostles in the room of the Apostles themselves, and we have the impression made by the Spirit through the word on the hearts of the hearers.

2d. "But we all with open face beholding as in a looking-glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord."

In this figure the looking-glass is the gospel; the image seen is Jesus Christ; and the change is wrought by the Spirit in those who look into the glass. Thus the word is the glass through which the Spirit is ministered and the change made.

Again, "God who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." In this figure the Apostles are the luminaries, or light-bearers, who reflect the light of Jesus Christ; by which light, or word, men are enlightened. "God commanded light to shine out of darkness." "God chose the weak to confound the mighty." "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and revealed them unto babes." "So it seemed good in thy sight."

I will now close this essay by saying, that no man now living has any knowledge of the Spirit but what he obtained from the word. Therefore, if the Spirit operates abstractedly, the man knows nothing of the operation.

Mr. Lynd may continue to write about the *abstract operation of the Spirit* until the end of time, without understanding what he means, or making any body else understand his meaning. He might as well talk of ink writing without a pen, or of seeing an image without a mirror, or of light shining without a candle or luminary.

If this abstract operation of the Spirit be not a species of witchcraft, by which the people are bewitched, and made to believe that the clergy are the great power of God for salvation, I do not know what it is.

Affectionately yours, M. WINANS.

News from the Churches.

BROCKPORT, Monroe county, N. Y., April 9th, 1839.

Dear brother Campbell,

IT is with great pleasure that I take my pen to address you at this time; indeed, it is always pleasing to communicate to others a knowledge of the advancement of the cause of truth. The prospects for the dissemination and reception of the gospel proclaimed by the Apostles, are much more encouraging in this western part of the state, than for some time past. The Disciples are generally awaking to the necessity of holding forth the word of life, and especially the proper method of doing it. Indeed I do not think they have ever been very parsimonious in bestowing their temporal things; but their efforts have not been the most wisely directed—they have never sustained a proclaimer among themselves, and under their own control. They have become satisfied, however, that the cause cannot be permanently and successfully advanced by preachers going through the country with the speed of a rail-car, and their proclamations being like angels' visits—"few and far between." The four congregations in Erie county have agreed to sustain an Evangelist for the current year, and have engaged brother Jones, from Ohio, and the congregations in this vicinity are making arrangements to sustain another a part or all of the time.

I have spent most of the time since the first of January proclaiming the word, and have witnessed some additions to the churches. Three or four have been added in Barry, Orleans county, from the Baptists, and are immersed, and a prospect of several more shortly. Additions were made also in Pike, Allegany county, and Transit and Williamsville, Erie county. It will be peculiarly gratifying to some brethren acquainted with the circumstances, to learn that I immersed, in Williamsville, Mrs. Evans. In Clarendon, Orleans county, also, six miles from my residence, I have immersed within a few months, eight; and on the last Lord's day in last month we organised and began to keep the ordinances. We commenced with nine, including myself and wife; and wo more being immersed the next day, make our present number eleven.

The circumstances under which this small beginning has been made are to me peculiarly interesting. It is in a place where I formerly preached Free-Will baptism, and abandoned at the time I became convinced of *the truth*, rather than excite the feelings of my friends. I had not spoken there since that time, until invited by a member of that church. I have been speaking there accordingly for more than a year in the midst of the most violent opposition, and the basest slanders from my former friends that I have ever met with. But, praised be the Lord! *the truth is mighty, and will prevail:* it carried me above them all, and there is not a dog to wag his tongue. They now whisper privately, "It is best to let them alone." I have learned that instead of railing at those who rail at it, it is far better to exhibit the meekness of the Lamb of God. The possession and exhibition of a truly Christian spirit will carry conviction to the mind, and make a way for the truth which no argument will do without it.

JOHN M. YEARNSHAW.

Georgetown, Kentucky, June 4, 1839

Last evening I returned from South Elkhorn (six miles from South Elkhorn where I labored hard, but pleasantly, for ten days, and obtained fifty-seven additions to the good cause, much to the surprize of all, and to the great joy of the brethren and friends. It was a victory long to be remembered. I was assisted, the greater part of the time, by our beloved and esteemed brother B. F. Hall.

Our talented and zealous young brother Brown was with us a part of two days, and left to fill an engagement of mine at Mount Vernon, (Dr. Fishback's old battle-ground,) where he gained nine additions. He was at Jeffersonville a few weeks past, and gained fifty-six, as I learn.

J. T. JOHNSON.

Georgetown, Kentucky, June 15. 1839.

Since I wrote you last I have visited Republican, about six miles from Lexington, and labored there five days with brother T. Smith who has charge of the congregation We gained twenty seven converts to the good cause, much to the joy of the brethren. It is near South Elkhorn, where we gained the fifty-seven. A few more efforts would leave but those who are resolved not to yield to the Lord.

The evening before the adjournment, brother J. C. Smith, the Agent of Bacon College, arrived, and suggested to us a proposition to obtain 1000 names for 100 dollars each, payable in five equal annual instalments; the fund to be permanent, and half of the interest to be sacredly devoted to the education of poor youths to be selected by the Trustees. Brother T. Smith and myself approved the plan, and at the conclusion of the meeting brother C. J. Smith apprised the congregation of what had been resolved on. Within 5 minutes, to the immortal honor of that neighborhood, ten persons enrolled their names. If those who are able will do likewise, the College will at once rise to the very highest eminence, and be an honor to its friends and a blessing to the people.

J. T. JOHNSON.

Lexington, Kentucky, June 14, 1839.

The good cause is yet progressing. Brethren Johnson and Thomas Smith have received about 27 within the last week, at Republican, within 5 miles of this place, and within a mile or two of South Elkhorn—making in that neighborhood about 82. Brother Gano commenced a meeting at Nicholasville, Jessamine county, Ky., this day week, which continued five days, and received about twenty-seven persons.

A. G. CHINN.

St. Johns, New Brunswick, May 11, 1839.

We are prospering slowly in this ungodly place We received into the church during the last year twenty-eight, and some seven or eight since the commencement of this. Brothers Howard and Doyle, in Nova Scotia, are almost constantly in the field. They are excellent men and efficient proclaimers of the gospel. Brother George Garrady, of this Province, and some others, are sounding the trumpet in New Brunswick. Brother G. is an excellent young men, and an able advocate of the truth.

I think it is your *duty* to visit Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. We have no subject agitating the churches to prevent your success. The speculations concerning Universalism, Materialism, or Unitarianism, &c. &c. have not agitated the few churches of the Lord, neither have the communities been disturbed much by such questions But we have (to use Mr Waterman's language) "blue stocking Calvinism," the fanaticism of New Lightism, and in all large places plenty of English Methodists, and the established church with her "pure faith and ancient liturgy," Add to the above hosts of Irish Catholics, and you have a picture of our communities.

W. W. EATON.

Rockport, May 21, 1839.

On Lord's day, 12th of this month, brethren T. M. Allen and Lancaster spoke to a large and attentive audience in our town. Though it rained all the time the people were collecting, we have never, on any occasion, had a larger congregation. At the close of our meeting that evening three persons confessed their faith in the Lord, and were immersed—one of whom was my son's wife. The following Tuesday night brother Lancaster again addressed the people; and next day again at 12 o'clock he spoke, and four others owned their Lord; and the same evening at the water one of my daughters volunteered, who, with the four were immersed by the authority of Jesus into the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, We had occasion to rejoice. The prospect with us is good. May Heaven's cause spread and prosper!

THOMAS HART.

Clarksburg, Indiana, May 30, 1839.

We are progressing in this part. We held a four days' meeting, commencing on Friday last and ending on Monday following, during which time the disciples were made to rejoice to see sinners returning to God.

J. H. CARTMEL.

Hamburg, Indiana, June 6, 1839.

Since my last we have had a refreshing time. About thirty-four have made the good confession at Silver Creek, and have been baptized and added to the church; and two at this place.

A. LITTELL.

Knox county, Indiana, June 4, 1839.

I am now on a preaching tour in the Wabash region. We immersed three yesterday and one the day before, and three were immersed on Lord's day a week ago, in the same congregation, on Baker's Prairie. This congregation is in order and prospering. I have been in eight other congregations since I came here, which appeared cold and in want of efficient proclaimers. Brother A. P. Law is a talented proclaimer, and a young brother William Tichner promises much usefulness. There are many prosperous congregations on the Illinois river regions where I reside.

Brother Campbell, when you visit the West I hope you will not forget Tazwell and Marshall counties. I live on the main stage route, leading from Springfield to Chicago, in Marshall county, near the line.

N. B.—David Sinclair, formerly of Ohio, and a Universalian preacher, who joined the Disciples some years since, has recently left his wife and eloped with the wife of another man. Brethren, be on your guard against impostors and deceivers!

HENRY D. PALMER.

Springville, Lawrence county, Pennsylvania, June 12, 1839.

I inform you that in this village, where sectarianism reigned almost without interruption some three years ago, there is now a good Christian meeting-house, and thirty-one disciples living close around, devoted to the ancient order of things; twelve of this number were added during last month—seven by immersion.

MILTON SHORT.

Nottingham, Harrison county, Ohio, June 10, 1839.

I take pleasure in informing you that a goodly number in this section of country have recently obeyed the word of the Lord. Nine in this place have submitted to Jesus the sinner's friend, within a few days—twelve in Washington, in this county, in the space of four or five weeks. I visited the Liberty church two weeks since, when three obeyed; besides, quite a number in other places. Wherever there are evangelists employed and *sustained*, *there* the good cause will achieve a glorious victory. On the other hand, show me a congregation destitute of an efficient preacher, there I will write *decay:* as a *congregation* it cannot sustain itself! When will the Disciples realize *this?* I do earnestly wish, my dear brother, that you would *just now* place and urge this matter on the attention of the churches. There is great need of one or two more evangelists in this section: I have not made the above request simply in reference to *this* part of the vineyard. I can name a number of churches that, two or three years ago were doing well, (while they enjoyed the labors of an evangelist once in two or four weeks,) *now*, sir, they are breaking up—going down, *down!* Very few of the elders of the churches understand the *law* sufficient to rule *well*, or else they lack *talent.*

ROBERT COOK.

AMERICAN BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

In this very respectable quarterly periodical, conducted by *Absalom Peters*, D. D., New York, second series, vol. 1, Nos. 1 and 2, there appeared an article headed "Campbellism," extending through two numbers, containing some 68 octavo pages—from the pen of the Rev. *R. W. Landis*, Jeffersonville, Pa. This gentleman, known to some of our readers as one of my special opponents, was pre-eminently disqualified to give a fair and impartial representation of my views to the readers of that work; and has therefore given one of the most highly wrought and finished caricatures, which, since the days of Obadiah Jennings, his *beau ideal* and prototype, has appeared. Nothing can be much more false in fact, uncandid, and apparently more malevolent than this review. I have twice written to Dr. Peters to ascertain whether I may be heard in the same work in defence; but as yet have received no answer. We wait for a reply. A. C.

FORRESTER & CAMPBELL

HAVE in press a second edition of the work formerly *labeled* "CHRISTIANITY RESTORED," under the title of *The CHRISTIAN SYSTEM.* It is "The Christian System, in reference to the Union of Christians, and a Restoration of Primitive Christianity, as plead in the current Reformation."

Instead of "the Principles and Rules of Interpretation" which appeared in the former edition, a series of new and original essays on the *Christian System* shall be substituted. These, together with the Extras on the Kingdom of Heaven, Remission of Sins, Regeneration, the Breaking of the Loaf, and some essays on Church Order, will make a volume of about 360 pages, which, printed on good type and paper, and substantially and neatly bound, they intend to retail at one dollar per volume.

The great demand for this work, (an edition of 4000 copies having been long since exhausted,) and the desire of the brethren to obviate various objections, and to prevent misrepresentation of their views, have occasioned not merely this new edition, but also the new essays on the Christian System. We humbly hope that this work, in the present form, will be much more useful than it was under the former arrangement, as we conceive it to be better adapted to the present crisis.

A. C.

HYMN-BOOKS.

THE PSALMS, HYMNS, and SPIRITUAL SONGS, which, after several years' approval by the brethren, have been neatly and correctly stereotyped, and thereby reduced in price, are now being delivered to order, neatly and elegantly bound. They are retailed at 25 cents, and wholesaled for cash at a liberal discount. Orders from a distance, addressed to *Forrester & Campbell*, No. 117, Wood street, Pittsburg, are promptly filled and despatched to all prominent and accessible points in the East and West. A few copies cannot be sent in a box, unless with other books.

FAMILY TESTAMENT.

FORRESTER & CAMPBELL are also publishing an elegant edition of the FAMILY TESTAMENT on a new and beautiful type; which, together with the CHRISTIAN SYSTEM, they hope to have in market sometime in October next. The edition will be a large octavo, at $2,00.

☞ AN unusual accumulation of writing, occasioned by my long absence—augmented, too, by almost a hundred new pages on the *Christian System*, will, I hope, apologize for any seeming neglect of my correspondents. We write as much every day as health will permit.

A. C.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER,

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME III.——NUMBER VIII.

BETHANY, VA. *AUGUST*, 1839.

OUR NAME.

DISCIPLES—CHRISTIANS—REFORMERS—CAMPBELLITES.

WHAT *shall we be called?* is one question; and *What shall men call us?* is another. We are responsible for the first—our neighbors for the second. There is virtue, or there is vice—moral good, or moral evil on both sides. If we miscall ourselves, the sin is ours—it is theirs, if they do it.

We all agree that there is potency in a name. The world is ruled by names, both in a good and in a bad sense. If this be true, we exert an influence, good or evil, by the name we wear, as we do by the character we form. It is of importance, then, that *we be called* what we are, as that *we be* what we are called.

That men should be called by their father's name is now a very common custom. It was not so from the beginning! It was not Mr. Adam and Mrs. Eve Adam. It was not Master Cain Adam, nor Abel Adam. Nor two thousand years after was it Mr. Abraham and Mrs. Abraham, nor Master Isaac Abraham. Nor a thousand years after was it Mr. David and Mrs. David, and Mr. Absalom David. Not even in the Christian era was it Mr. Zecharias and Mrs. Elizabeth Zecharias, nor Master John Zecharias. The custom is rather modern, and only prevails where polygamy and concubinage have been proscribed.

But that men should be called by their leaders—nations, by their founders—and people, by their country, is almost as old as the Flood. Canaanites, Hebrews, Israelites, Egyptians, Arabians, Pythagoreans Platonists, Epicureans, Sadducees, &c. are monuments of this fact.—But when fathers, and leaders, and founders became numerous, and names derived from them also multiplied and increased, men began to be called after some remarkable incident or tenet in their history. Thus came the Pharisees, the Stoics, the Academicians, &c. &c.

The Gentiles are fond of leaders; and, being proud of them, were called by them. The passion soon got into the church. Hence, as early as the first Gentile churches, there were some proud of Paul; others, of Apollos; and some, of Cephas. It was in vain that Paul protested against this schismatic spirit. The Corinthians, the Nicolaitans, Arians, Pelagians, Lutherans, Calvinists, Arminians, &c. &c. are proofs that the authority of the great Apostle has hitherto been inadequate to restrain the passion for popes and parties.

Call no man on earth Father, or Leader, or Master, is a positive precept. Under that flag we put to sea when we set sail from the moorings of sectarianism for the haven of ancient and primitive Christianity. When we drew up our Prospectus for our first publication, we headed it "*The Christian;*" and had it not been that we found ourselves anticipated we should have adhered to the title. I hesitated between the title "*Baptist Christian*" and "*Christian Baptist*," and on suggesting my embarrassment to a friend, who has since given himself due credit for the hint, as an original idea; he thought the latter was a better passport into favor than either of the others. We never fully approved, but from expediency adopted it. Finding that our brethren were being called "Christian Baptists," we changed the title of our work when we enlarged it, designing it only to be the *harbinger* of better times, and not the insignia nor armorial of a new party.

The Lutherans, Calvinists, Arminians, judging us according to their standard, and weighing us in their balances, have nicknamed us "*Campbellites.*" They wish us to take no precedence of them. They are proud of the livery they wear, and would have us to be like themselves—the followers of a fallible earthly leader. But our Master forbids us to assume any such designation, as derogatory to him, to ourselves, and tending to schism.

Some would have us call ourselves *Reformers*, as if this word was specific of any thing. Like the word *Protestant*, it means nothing positive or definite, either in principle or in practice. There have been *protestants* and *reformers*, political, economical, ecclesiastic, and sacerdotal, times and ways without number. We are not reformed Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, or any such things. Why, then, misrepresent ourselves? We may be reformed Baptists or reformed sinners, and yet a great way off *Christians*.

Some like the name "*Bible Christians*," as if there were Christians without the Bible; or Bible, and *not Bible Christians*. There are no *Koran* Christians. Hence *Bible* before *Christian* is like *human* before *man*, or *female* before *woman*. A *human* man, a *female* woman, and a *Bible* Christian are creatures of the same parentage.

I am a Baptist, a Presbyterian, an Episcopalian, a Congregationalist, a Methodist, a Catholic, in the proper unappropriated sense of these words. But not one of them, nor all of them, express my views, my profession, or my practice as a disciple of Christ. In other words, I am an immerser; I believe in a presbytery or eldership in every congregation, and in overseers of the flock. I regard every community as independent of every other in what concerns its own internal acts and regulations—I am *methodical* in my arrangements and proceedings—and *Catholic* in all my charities, as I am in the doctrine, morality, and piety of the gospel. But all of these terms do not fully nor perfectly represent my religious profession; therefore I would falsify if I chose any one of them, or all of them, as representative of my profession as a religious man.

We have, then, only to choose between two scriptural titles—"*Disciples*" and "*Christians.*" Of their respective claims upon our attention, next month. A. C.

MORALITY OF CHRISTIANS—*No. XVI.*

Some men would be the janitors of Pandemonium for a living. They would invent machines for cursing, perjury, and blasphemy, if they could find a ready market for them; and would flatter themselves that neither the inventor, nor the manufacturer, nor the vender, but the operator who uses them, is culpable. The exhalations of iniquity that rise from such hearts to becloud the understanding of men, that their own corrupt and corrupting interests are truth, and reason, and good sense; and the contrary of these are the only falsehoods they can appreciate. Oh! what pitchy darkness has sin thrown over the intellects of men! Many who once could have reasoned like angels, now reason as the demons of perdition. God has given over multitudes to a reprobate or undiscerning mind. The conscience, the understanding, the feelings, the affections of men, all—all are depraved by sinning. The understanding is blinded, the conscience is seared, the feelings are blunted, the affections are alienated from all beauty and loveliness by the same process of tampering with temptation, of habitually pressing upon the restraints of conscience and of moral feeling.

The man that reasons well on morality, not on one topic, but on all its branches, must himself be moral. He must be disinterested in all the dictates of reason, in all the verdicts of conscience; or, in other words, he must never think of excuses for himself: if he do, he is that

instant bribed, and his reasonings are one-sided, partial, and unjust.—If a Judge should be free from bribes, that he may dispense even-handed justice to those who stand before him, behooves it not that he that pronounces a just sentence upon his own actions, or forms a correct judgment of himself, be free from all moral obliquities, partialities, or leanings? Hence it is often necessary that we pursue the course of Nathan with King David, and bring the transgressor to pronounce sentence against himself in the person of another.

For such reasons as these we never expect to convince men of the falsehood of their reasonings in vindication of their illegal actions.—There are too many eloquent attorneys in their hearts for one who stands without. Moreover, the whole court and jury are on the side of the accused.

The other day, says Wm. Honestus, I met with two speculators, an old one and a young one. They were whip and spur traversing the country, purchasing from the farmers an important necessary of life. They were in possession of intelligence of an unexpected rise in the article. Two or three days only, and their information would be public property. Their three days of grace were the three days of ignorance of the community from which they were pocketing forty per cent. in every transaction. They knew that fortune now depended upon despatch, and they were so well acquainted with the community as to know who would stand to a bargain, or who would not, (of which latter class unfortunately for the speculators there was a majority.) They therefore had to post the more rapidly to catch the honorable men. They succeeded to a very considerable extent. Having heard the affair, I asked the gentlemen who were professors of Christ's religion, how this tallied with the golden precepts of the Messiah. The elder gentleman replied it was all fair play; it was the regular custom of the mercantile world—the law of trade. "*Knowledge*," said he, "is *property*, as well as *power*." "I paid for my foreknowledge, and this is the use I make of it. If I did not expect to turn it to good account, I should not have paid for it." "Very good," said the Moralist; "you purchase the means of taking advantages of your neighbors. You imply that you have it reduced to a system; and you act as from fixed principles, and justify yourself because you have paid for your knowledge. It has cost you something; and you must make it pay costs, and a little more, I presume."

So reasoned John Nimbletoe during the time of the continental money. Having heard one day that it was about being depreciated fifty per cent., and having a few thousand dollars on hand, he bought the swiftest horse he could find in the city and county of Philadelphia, and

over mountain and valley galloped to what was in those days called "the back woods." He was a whole week in advance of the news, and laid out all his money in lands at the selling price in sound currency.—He paid the cash, had the lands legally transferred, and all things secured according to law, before any of the ensnared heard of the *blow up*. He paid for his knowledge; and besides he paid an extra sum for a fleet horse, and was at considerable expense of limb, muscle, and purse in the transaction. Did this justify his conduct? The young speculator winced a little; and after a while muttered, "The cases are not just parallel;" while the old jockey said "it was all right; the money must decline in some one's hands, and he was a fool that would let it die in his, if he could shuffle it round and divide the loss. I would, however," continued he, "in such a case have given a generous price!" "The cases are not parallel, I repeat," said the younger of the two. "We paid good money for all our purchases." "Grant it," said Honestes; "but you did not pay *enough* of it; you knew that in a few days those honorable men would have asked, and they would have received forty per cent. more. Now where is the difference in effect? In the one case the farmers lost in the price of their land, fifty per cent: in the other, they lost in the produce forty per cent. The buyer in the former case made fifty—in the latter, forty per cent. The difference is ten per cent. in the fact; but the principle in morality is the same.

Now that a Christian who believes that his Master's rule is, '*Whatever you would that men should do to you, do you even so to them*,' would seek to justify himself in such transactions, we regard as a strong proof how much reason, understanding, and conscience may be perverted and corrupted by dishonorable tamperings with temptation, or by yielding to the mandates of avarice, cupidity, or any other unhallowed passion.

Furthermore, amongst those callings and professions which are either directly or indirectly contrary to the morality of Christianity, we feel strongly inclined to place that of the *speculators*, not in theology nor science, but in trade, commerce, and mercantile operations. Still, of speculators there are different classes, and much difference in the same class. Therefore, that this subject may be fully discussed, we shall in our next define A SPECULATOR, and show that there are merchants who are not speculators, and speculators that are not merchants.

A. C.

ENEMIES OF RELIGION.

RELIGION has no mortal enemy, save immorality and corruption. A man must be degraded to the last degree before he can be completely divorced from it.—*Degerando.*

SHORT SERMONS ON CHRISTIAN PRACTICE—*No. IV.*

ON BIBLE-READING—*No. I.*

MOTTO.—*Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is truth.* John xvii. 17. Follow peace with all men, and *holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord.* Heb. xii 14. Be you holy, for I am holy—Holy in all manner of behaviour. 1 Peter i. 15, 16. Having purified your souls by obeying the truth through the Spirit, unto unfeigned love of the brethren. 1 Peter i. 22. Being born again, not of corruptible, but incorruptible seed; by the word* of God, that liveth and abideth forever. 1 Peter 1. 23–25.

WE speak to God in prayer, praise, thanksgiving. He speaks to us in nature, in his providence, in his word. Creation—universal nature is, indeed, a voice—"a still small voice"—a whisper from God in the ear of reason to the heart of man. "The heavens," said the royal poet, "declare the glory of God: the firmament showeth his handy work: day unto day *utters speech*, and night unto night *teacheth knowledge*. There is no speech nor language where *their voice* is not heard: their *line* [or sound] is gone out through all the earth, and *their words* unto the end of the world."

"What though in solemn silence all
Move round this dark terrestrial ball—
What though no real voice nor sound
Amid the radiant orbs be found—
In reason's ear they all rejoice
And utter forth a glorious voice;
Forever singing as they shine,
The hand that made us is divine!"—ADDISON.

But in his moral government, as well as in creation, God speaks:—"The Lord is righteous in all his ways, and holy in all his works." Ps. cxlv. 17. "Just and righteous are thy ways, [providences,] thou King of saints." Rev. xv. 4. "By terrible things in righteousness wilt thou answer us, O God of our salvation!" Ps. lxv. 5. "The works of his hand are verity and judgment." Ps. cxi. 7. "All his works are done in truth: he loveth righteousness and judgment. The earth is full of the goodness of the Lord." Ps. xxxiii. 4, 5.

But it is in the Bible alone that God speaks to man on his moral nature, relations, and destiny. That wondrous volume is so composed, arranged, and inspired, that it can be made to speak to man in answer to all his prayers for light, knowledge, motive, strength, comfort, in special, precise, and direct reference to any given case, in which he can by any possibility be placed.

Men have ingeniously contrived instruments of music on which all sorts of tunes can be played; and thus a few strings when touched by the hand of a master, are made to express all the variety of human sentiments, frames, and feelings. Such a religious and moral instrument is the Bible, only incomparably more wonderfully fitted to its end. The Spirit that inspired the men that spoke and wrote it is ever present with it, giving it a life-inspiring, a soul-renewing efficacy; insomuch that no man can possibly fall in love with the Bible, and become a habitual and prayerful student of the Book of Life, without being inspired, animated, remoulded, and new created by the omnipotent moral energies of that holy and divine sanctifier, the Spirit of the

* *Dia logou* and *dia pneumatos*. It is the same in construction in verse 22 and 23:—"*Through the Word*"—"*through the Spirit.*"

living God, which breathes upon our souls in all its facts, declarations, invitations, promises, precepts, and threatenings.

On all hands, and in all schools, ancient and modern, *happiness*, perfect and complete, is confessed to be the universal aim, pursuit, and end of our being. It is to be regretted that the way of attainment is not so universally seen and appreciated as the end proposed. The Bible says, and says truly, for it speaks with authority, that holiness is the way to happiness; and that no other way exists or can be found. If this be true, (and who can disprove it?) then the means of holiness are the means of happiness; for happiness is to holiness as the shadow to the substance, or as light to the sun.

But what is holiness? It is sanctification. And what is sanctification? It is a separation or consecration to God in heart as well as in state. And what is this separation of heart, but a conformity of views, feelings, and desires; or an approving and choosing the same thing? To will what God wills, to love what he loves, and to hate what he hates, is holiness in principle and in heart; and to carry this out in practice is holiness in fact and in truth.

This implies a knowledge of God and his will, and of our own nature and condition, which can be acquired with infallible certainty, and with a soul-subduing power, but from One Book, and only one among all the books on this wide earth. The intelligence in that volume is to holiness what holiness is to happiness. They are united by a relation intimate and powerful as that of cause and effect.

Bible-reading, then, comes recommended to us by this highest of considerations: Jesus himself, the LIVING and INCARNATE WORD OF GOD, proposes this word to us as the alone and all-sufficient *means of sanctification*—"Sanctify [or make them holy] *through thy truth:* thy word is truth." The fact that the Lord of Life has selected this word as the instrument and means of sanctification, is the best proof in the universe of its perfect adaptation to that end. That it is, then, the divinely wise and effectual mean of purifying, refining, elevating, and ennobling the human affections—of creating a clean heart, and renewing a right spirit in man, is placed beyond a rational doubt. Without farther evidence we then conclude, that the truth, or the word of God, is the true and proper instrument of holiness.

But what means Bible reading? In one sentence, it is the devout, prayerful, habitual ponderings of the heart upon the facts, declarations, calls, precepts, promises, and threatenings of the Book of God; not an occasional reading of a book or a chapter in the volume—not a periodical, measured, daily attention to some portions of sacred scripture; but a concentration of the whole mind upon the whole subject of revelation, as the very elements of devotion, and unfailings springs of our pleasures and delights.

Such an earnest engagedness of the whole heart upon the subject, differs exceedingly from the readings of the textuary, the theologian, the disputant, the critic, the formalist, and the ordinary professor. The soul pants for this reading as the thirsty roe pants for the brooks of water. The Bible, thus read, is read for pleasure, for enjoyment, for communion with God—as a prelibation of the joys of celestial light, purity, and love; the nature and advantages of which, we shall have to make the subject of another sermon. Meanwhile, we beseech

and exhort all our brethren to be more distinguished by Bible reading as above defined, than by any other peculiarity whatsoever. This secures every thing—piety and humanity, holiness and happiness, usefulness and honor. No man can possibly be habitually and cordially pondering upon the communications of the Holy Spirit, without feeling the Spirit of God working in him to will and do every thing pleasing to God and profitable to man as he has opportunity. A. C.

UNION OF CHRISTIANS—*No. III.*

The union of sects, and the union of Christians, are not identical propositions. Some of the sects must be united to Christ to make them Christians, before they could be a component part of a union of Christians. In one word, a *sectarian* and a *Christian* are not equivalent terms. A Christian adheres to Christ—a sectarian to his party. Now unless Christ would adhere to a party as such, a Christian could not!

But it will be said, that Christ being judge of the hearts of all, would have another rule of communion than which mortals could propose to themselves. True, he might have; but in the case before us he is not supposed to use it; he is supposed to walk by the Book, not by his omniscience of all hearts. Now as walking by the Book he could not fraternize with any party that walks, in whole or in part, by any other book, written or not written; or who has any other foundation of Christian union than that which he himself has laid. Now as no sect *takes the Book, the whole Book, and nothing but the Book*, Jesus and his Apostles could not belong to any sect on earth. The Christian faith, piety, morality, and spirit are necessarily antisectarian and catholic.

Can any one imagine that the Messiah, were he on earth, would be a Presbyterian, an Episcopalian, a Methodist, a Baptist, or Unitarian! Could he associate with any one of these as his party, or support and countenance their views and measures as his own? No man of sane mind or reason can think so. I doubt not but he would find in most, if not in all parties, some who sincerely believe in him, and love and serve him as the Messiah and Son of God; but these are not sectarians. These go not for the party, but for the Master. They may not understand all his will; but so far as they do understand it, they cordially practise it. If they do not, they are not the persons of whom we speak.

The question is, Is there any *profession* of all the professions of Christendom, to whom Jesus or his Apostles would be obliged to make a tender of themselves as communicants? This may appear a curious, but it is a practical and an important question. Certainly such a pro-

fession there must be, or there is not a green spot in Christendom. What can it be? A profession founded upon any human leader, or leaders? Certainly not. Jesus and his Apostles could, on no condition, fraternize with a profession which calls itself after any person, creed, tenet, or practice whatever: for that would be to repudiate themselves, and certainly they could not honor those that thus renounce and dishonor them by such meretricious conduct.

Indeed, unless gifted by omniscience, the Apostles or their Master could not, until they had read Eusebius, Mosheim, Buck, or the Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, understand what Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Methodist, Baptist, or Unitarian means. They could not by any possibility propose themselves as candidates to any of these parties. They have not the name of the profession to which the Apostles belonged; and certainly they would at least look for the old name. They would doubtless be obliged to go to that profession which now wears the name under which they lived and died. There are, then, but two parties on this earth that could expect even a call from the Saviour or his holy Apostles were they to revisit this earth. When Jesus first came, '*he came unto his own*, but then his own party received him not.' "The Christians" or "the Disciples," would then be the only two *professions* that could possibly be honored by such a visit. "The Christians" no doubt think they would have the preference; and probably so they might, if they had not appended to their title the epithet "*Unitarian.*" For surely there were no Unitarian Christians, any more than Roman Catholic Christians, during the life of the Apostles. But suppose the Apostles did actually call upon "*the Christians*" for Christian lodging and entertainment, and on hearing them contend for Unitarianism, should repudiate that name and all that it represents, would they not be excluded from their communion, and set adrift on an ocean of partyism? Certainly they would, for the same reasons that the "Christians" that now support the "Christian Palladium" have, by their committee, positively refused to admit my defence against their sectarian imputations even to appear upon the pages of their periodical.* Who, then, more *sectarian* than these Unitarian Christians! It is not, then, so inexplicably mysterious that the new Editor spoke as he did, on our proposed plan of Christian union, as quoted in our last number. Under his sectarian views and conscience he cannot reach it. The light still shines in darkness, yet the darkness has not learned to comprehend it.

We then said he did not understand it. We say so still. But we shall leave the matter under his reflections, as well as to the consideration of our other readers, for another month. A. C.

* So Mr. Henry Grew has informed me.

TO THE CHURCHES PROFESSING PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY, IN NEW YORK.

Fellow-Disciples,

THERE is no class of the community, in this or in any other country professing the Christian religion, whose every movement is more closely watched, or from whom there is more expected, of consistency in the cultivation and exercise of every Christian virtue, than from *you*. The adherents of the numerous theological creeds—as well as the Sceptic, the Deist, and the Atheist, watch with vigilant eye the doings of the professed followers of Jesus, and of the apostolic churches; and nothing rejoices them more than to witness in such, any error in doctrine or practice, or the manifestation of an opposite temper from the spirit exemplified and inculcated by the holy Redeemer. Nor should we, in common fairness, be too ready to blame them for so doing: are they not justified in expecting, from the professed followers of the *Scriptures only*, the exemplification, to a high degree, of the Christian virtues! of bowels and mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, and long-suffering—of whatsoever things are *true*—whatsoever things are honorable—whatsoever things are *just*—whatsoever things are *pure*—whatsoever things are *lovely*—whatsoever things are of *good report!* Yes, indeed, because they are the professed *imitators* and scholars of Him, whose whole life was spent in devotion to the glory of God, and for the present and eternal welfare of mankind.

It is delightful to know that there are many, and that the number is on the increase, who discard all human creeds, and hold fast the traditions of the Apostles of the Lord Jesus Christ: "*the word of truth*, the gospel of our salvation"—and that they are not more anxious to be found steadfast in the Apostles' doctrine, in the fellowship, in the breaking of bread, and in prayer; than in the Christian graces of "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance;" and that such disciples are to be found in many churches, which, unhappily, differ from each other on various particulars, which they conscientiously think justify them in separating and worshipping apart from others, who are as conscientious and devoted as themselves.

If these are facts, ought we not to put the question solemnly to ourselves, Are we, indeed, justified in the judgment of our Lord and Saviour, in withdrawing from each other; and treating one another as if we were aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, because you differ on some things, which, if narrowly looked into, will be found to justify the exercise of long-suffering and forbearance? I *know* you will at once answer in the negative: but you may reply by saying, The things on which we differ are not those on which it is our duty to forbear with each other. What are the points of difference, then? I am addressing those churches only which hold that there should be no difference on the *positive* commands of Christ; and that do not consider any church can legitimately assume the appellation of Christian, which is not founded on the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone—acknowledging but one body, and one spirit, even as we are called, in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all,

who is above all, and through all, and in you all. On this the churches which I address are one: On what, then, do you disagree! *Remember*, dear friends, you profess to be agreed on the *first*, the *most essential*, the *indispensable principles*. Think, O! think well of this! I have known churches differ and separate because they were not agreed on the best time of meeting on the Lord's day; or whether the Lord's supper should be eat in the forenoon or evening—on the order of public worship—on the proper time for admitting new members—on the propriety of holding meetings of the church, during the week, and numbers of things of the like nature, respecting the duty of *performing* which, no difference existed; but respecting the time, the frequency, or the particular mode of performing, many think, and think conscientiously, we have no certain directions in the inspired volume. I have known, also, divisions to be the result of personal *likes* and *dislikes* of leading brethren; and of *disputes* where a heated temper has been called to preside as umpire, and has pronounced the verdict in favor of division. Dear brethren, I have lived long enough in this weary world, and have witnessed sufficient of human nature, both in myself and in other people, to justify me in saying, that, in most cases of schism amongst Christians, the *causes* are attributable to either a mistaken, though conscientious, sense of duty, in attaching such an importance to some parts of church order, as has led to the sacrifice of the still more important and essential duty of the love of the brethren and Christian forbearance, patience and long-suffering; or, *to mere feeling*. When these passions, which are common to us as human beings, become excited—especially that passion, which we all possess in a greater or less degree—self-esteem; the judgment is very liable to be taken prisoner. and carried captive by mistaken conscientiousness, and the commonwealth of the mind is thrown into disorder, and disquietude; and, alas! the church of Christ, who is the Prince of Peace, is distracted and shattered into pieces! One party blames the other party—recrimination follows recrimination—evil speaking—backbiting—envying and strife following in the train—and the consequences are, the breach becomes wider and wider: the disciples individually experience not the joy and peace of the gospel, which they otherwise would feel—many are discouraged—inquirers stand aloof from the churches: the gates of Zion mourn, because few come to her solemn feasts; and in many instances, the candlestick has been removed out of its place, and 'Ichabod' is written on the door; for the glory is departed!

Dear friends, this, as many of you who have lived for twenty or more years in the Christian profession, know is but a faint and imperfect portrait of the reality; a picture over which every sincere disciple of our blessed Saviour will mourn and weep, or ought at least to do so. "Turn us again, O Lord God of hosts! and cause thy face to shine, and so we shall be saved."

How, dear friends, does the matter then stand between you as churches? You profess to have but one creed, and that the only sure one—the scriptures of Christ and his Apostles. It is an article of your creed, that the glorious gospel of the blessed God is designed and adapted to raise mankind from the curse and dominion of sin, and to mould the human family into one body; receiving from Christ, the head, that life and light, which diffuses *health*, happiness, and immortal vigor through every part—it is an article of your creed; for you have but *one*

creed; that when this gospel is believed and obeyed, it introduces its recipients into the high relationship of sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty, enjoying the forgiveness of sins through the blood of Jesus, and the hope of eternal life; a life of perfect purity and ineffable happiness; in a spiritual glorified body, like that of the Son of God. It is an article of your creed, that every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself even as he is pure; lives soberly, righteously, and godly in this present evil world; follows peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord; knows that he is passed from death unto life, because he loves the brethren; for love is of God, and every one who loveth not, knoweth not God, for God is love; and every one who loveth him that begat, loveth him also who is begotten of him. You all know, my brethren, that it is only by thus possessing the spirit of Christ, that we can know that we are the children of God, and that we can show to others that we are such. How is it possible that we can demonstrate this, except in our social relationships as families, churches, and members of the community? Yes, it is in those relations only that we have an opportunity of proving ourselves the heirs of God, the sons of peace, by love unfeigned, by patience, long suffering, peace-making, bearing all things, believing all things, enduring all things, and fully displaying universal subjection to the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ. I say, these sentiments are articles of your creed; as churches, you are of one mind on these most essential principles. But how is it, then, that we should, as churches, give, in many things, such an affecting contradiction to our profession as imitators of Christ, and of the primitive churches, by being divided and subdivided into separate churches; having no visible fellowship or intercourse with each other? Is this like love, or meekness, or long-suffering, or peace-making? Is this endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace? Or is it in accordance with the will and express commands of our blessed Saviour? A new *commandment* I give unto you, that ye love one another; by this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one towards another. Ah, no!

Should we not be acting more in the spirit of primitive disciples of Jesus Christ, if we were to meet together and confess our faults one to another, and to God, and implore his forgiveness; and to determine, by the grace of God, that we henceforth, as individuals and as churches, co-operate for each other's edification; as well as in spreading the gospel in our own respective localities, and to every place where our influence may reach?

In such a place as New York there might be, in perfect harmony with Christianity, numerous assemblies of disciples, of one heart and mind, under a well-regulated and efficient eldership, "*striving together for the faith of the gospel*," and giving a united display of the power of the gospel in leading the disciples to live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present evil world, and in co-operating and diffusing pure Christianity in opposition to spurious Christianity.

I have thus, dear friends, presumed to address you, with the design of awaking your attention to the subject of union amongst the followers of the same Lord. A great evil exists! It is the duty of every Christian to remedy the evil—to do it soon—to do it now! Remember the words of the Divine Master—"Blessed are the peace-makers, for

they shall be called the children of God:" and of Paul—"Let us, therefore, follow the things which make for peace, and the things whereby one may edify each other." The subject is worthy your most intense and patient consideration: should you, as churches, give the subject the consideration which it demands, many advantages might be stated which would necessarily arise from union; some of those advantages I may take another opportunity of showing. Meantime "consider of it, take advice, and speak your minds." Judges, chap. xix. verse 30th.

Yours in the love of the truth,

GAIUS.

New York, April, 1839.

PROOFS OF BENEVOLENCE IN CREATION.

[*From Lord Brougham's new volume of Dissertations.*]

How well might all creation have existed and been continued, though the air had not been balmy in spring, or the shade and the spring refreshing in summer; had not the earth been enamelled with flowers, and the air scented with perfumes! How needless for the propagation of plants was it that the seed should be enveloped in fruits the most savory to our palate; and if those fruits serve some other purpose, how foreign to that purpose was the formation of our nerves, so framed as to be soothed or excited by their flavor! We here perceive design, because we trace adaptation. But we at the same time perceive benevolent design, because we perceive gratuitous and supererogatory enjoyment bestowed. Thus, too, see the care with which animals of all kinds are tended from their birth. The mother's instinct is not more certainly the means of securing and providing for her young, than her gratification in the act of maternal care is great, and is also needless for making her perform that duty. The grove is not made vocal during pairing and incubation, in order to secure the laying or the hatching of eggs; for if it were as still as the grave, or were filled with the most discordant croaking, the process would be as well performed. So, too, mark the care with which injuries are remedied by what has been correctly called the *vis medicatrix*. Is a muscle injured? Suppuration takes place, the process of granulation succeeds, and new flesh is formed to supply the gap; or if it is less wide, a more simple healing process knits together the several parts. Is a bone injured? A process commences by which an extraordinary secretion of boney matter takes place, and the void is supplied. Nay, the irreparable injury of a joint gives rise to the formation of a new hinge, by which the same functions may be not inconveniently, though less perfectly performed. Thus, too, recovery of vigor after sickness, is provided for by increased appetite; but there is here superadded, generally, a feeling of comfort and lightness, an enjoyment of existence so delightful, that it is a common remark how nearly this compensates the sufferings of the illness. In the economy of the mind it is the same

thing. All our exertions are stimulated by curiosity, and the gratification is extreme of satisfying it. But it might have been otherwise ordered, and some painful feeling might have been made the only stimulant to the acquisition of knowledge. So the charm of novelty is proverbial; but it might have been the unceasing cause of the most painful alarms. Habit renders every thing easy; but the repetition might have only increased the annoyance. The loss of one organ makes the others more acute. But the partial injury might have caused, as it were, a general paralysis.

[Notwithstanding these evidences of goodness, the noble author has to admit the prevalence of dreadful evils; and though he does not refer to sin as the source of human suffering, he speaks as follows of the indication which this suffering gives of a future state of retribution.]

Taking both worlds together—for certainly were our views limited to the present sublunary state, we may well affirm that no solution whatever could even be imagined of the difficulty—if we are never again to live; if those we here loved are forever lost to us; if our faculties can receive no farther expansion; if our mental powers are only trained and improved to be extinguished at their acme—then, indeed, are we reduced to the melancholy and gloomy dilemma of the Epicureans; and evil is confessed to chequer—nay, almost to cloud over our whole lot, without the possibility of comprehending why, or of reconciling its existence with the supposition of a Providence at once powerful and good.

RELICS.

The article of *relics* has been a means of vast revenue to the Priests. A brisk sale is therefore kept up in this holy article of Romish faith. No Priest, therefore, can oppose the home manufacture, or foreign importation of relics. No man will studiously cut off his own temporal gains. Hence the zeal of Priests for relics.

But antiquarians should encourage the brisk sale, and manufacture of relics. They throw amazing light on the dark things and scenes of antiquity. For instance, in France alone there are *four* entire skulls of St. John! In Spain, and France, and at Rome are shown the *four* identical nails by which our Lord was nailed on the cross! In different chapels in Spain and Belgium there are shown, with great reverence, *eight* arms of St. Matthew! Of course that eminent Apostle must have had forty fingers! How amazing the rich discoveries made by relics to the members of the Antiquarian Society! Moreover, in Spain and in Belgium they have each the entire heads of St. Peter and St. Paul. Now every body is not acquainted with the fact thus disclosed by relics—that those two Apostles had each of them *two heads!* This the faithful must believe on the pains of denying the infallibility of the Holy Mother!

In the church of St. Peter, at Burgos, they show the cross of the *good thief*, somewhat *worm-eaten;* with Judas' lantern, and the tail of Balaam's ass, nicely preserved! In the same church they show a few

of the blossoms of Aaron's rod, uncommonly fresh; They have also a small specimen of the manna in a pot. They also show a finger and an arm of St. Anna, the mother of the Virgin. And as the Virgin is "the Mother of God," they consider these relics as extremely valuable, being the relics of "the Grand-Mother of God."

But among the various relics of Rome few excite more profound attention and lively veneration than a vial containing a quantity of the breath of St. Joseph, caught by an angel, while the said Joseph was blowing very hard, while splitting wood! How precious!

This is matched only by the following, which has been recently going the rounds of the European papers, the traveller having given full currency to the very interesting antiquarian discovery! We copy it from a late foreign paper.

Relics.—A traveller on the continent, visiting a cathedral, was shown by the sacristan, among other marvels, a dirty opaque glass vial. After eyeing it for some time, the traveller said, "Do you call this a relic? Why, it is empty." "Empty," retorted the sacristan indignantly—"Sir, it contains some of the darkness that Moses spread over the land of Egypt."

What an amazing light do *relics* throw over the dark pages of history! No wonder that our very learned, and very polished, and very well read Priests encourage the *manufacture* and brisk sale of relics!

But after all, in sober sadness, to what an awful degradation has the apostate church of Rome sunk, while she thus relies for support on lying wonders and base impostures.

And what is the sole motive? To make money! To enrich the Priests by the plunder of the people! The Romish religion, therefore, first plunders the members of its sect of their lawful gains and hard earned living; and then ruins their immortal souls by idolatry and superstition.

Roman Catholics! come out of the cruel, and plundering, and ruinous sect of the Priests! Come into the glorious gospel, and the freedom and grace of God's dear children! Amen.

Protestant Vindicator.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN SCHOOLS.

Says Cousin, the most distinguished French philosopher of the age, "Religious and moral education is the first want of a people. Without this, every other education is not only without real utility, but in some respects dangerous. If, on the contrary, religious education has taken firm root, intellectual education will have complete success. I know something of Europe, and never have I seen good schools where the spirit of Christian charity was wanting. Christianity ought to be the basis of the instruction of the people; we must not flinch from the open profession of this maxim; it is no less politic than honest. Let our popular schools, then, be Christian; let them be so entirely and earnestly. Religion is an indestructible power—genuine Christianity is a means of civilization for the people."

Guizot, equally distinguished as a literary man and as a statesman who has for many years occupied prominent stations in the French ministry, and was for some time at the head of the department of Public Instruction, expresses similar convictions:—"Among the objects of instruction there is one which demands from me particular notice: or rather, the law itself, in placing it at the head of all others, has committed it especially to our zeal; I mean moral and religious instruction. It is absolutely necessary that popular education should not be addressed to the understanding only; it must embrace the whole soul, and especially must it awaken that moral conscience which ought to be elevated and strengthened in proportion as the mind is developed."

To which we add two paragraphs from Professor Stowe's Report of what he learned in Europe:—

"I inquired of all classes of teachers, and men of every grade of religious faith, instructors in common schools, high schools, and schools of art, of professors in colleges, universities, and professional seminaries, in cities and in the country, in places where there was a diversity of creeds, of believers and unbelievers, of rationalists and enthusiasts, of Catholics and Protestants; and I never found but one reply, and that was, that to leave moral faculty uninstructed, was to leave the most important part of the human mind undeveloped, and to strip education of almost every thing that can make it valuable; and that the Bible, independently of the interest attending it, as containing the most ancient and influential writings ever recorded by human hands, and comprising the religious system of almost the whole civilized world, is itself the best book that can be put into the hands of children to interest, to exercise, and to unfold their intellectual and moral powers. Every teacher whom I consulted, repelled with indignation the idea that moral instruction is not proper for schools, and spurned with contempt the allegation that the Bible cannot be introduced into common schools without encouraging a sectarian bias in the matter of teaching; an indignation and contempt which I believe will be fully participated in by every high-minded teacher in Christendom."

"Another striking feature of the Prussian system is its moral and religious character. Its morality is pure and elevated, its religion entirely removed from the narrowness of sectarian bigotry. What parent is there, loving his children and wishing to have them respected and happy, who would not desire that they should be educated under such a kind of moral and religious influence as has been described? Whether a believer in revelation or not, does he not know that without sound morals there can be no happiness, and that there is no morality like the morality of the New Testament? Does he not know that without religion the human heart can never be at rest, and that there is no religion like that of the Bible? Every well informed man knows that, as a general fact, it is impossible to impress the obligations of morality with any efficiency on the heart of a child, or even on that of an adult, without an appeal to some code which is sustained by the authority of God; and for what code will it be possible to claim this authority, if not for the code of the Bible?"

Biblical Recorder.

STATISTICS OF INDIANA.

We thank our brother Emmons for this article, which in one view presents the progress of the apostolic gospel in the state of Indiana, so far as accurate information has been obtained. Such historic information is highly useful not only to the brethren in that state, but to all who wish to visit it, or migrate to it. An annual meeting in some central point of each state in the union, conducted on similar principles, exhibiting the statistics of the churches united in the primitive faith and manners, would in many ways greatly promote the prosperity of the cause. Co-operation and combination of effort is the great secret of success. Of which matters, more in detail at a more convenient season. A. C.

GENERAL MEETING AT INDIANAPOLIS.

Emmaus, 25th June, 1839.

Brother Campbell:

Dear Brother—The meeting, an advertisement of which was published some while since in the Millennial Harbinger, Christian Preacher, and Heretic Detector, took place at Indianapolis, commencing on Friday the 7th, and ending on Tuesday the 11th of June inst. There were present about fifty public speakers, among whom from abroad were Elders Barton W. Stone, Arthur Crihfield, and John Taffe. On the morning of the second day the meeting was organized for business, by calling Elder John O'Kane to preside, and brother Perseus K. Harris as Secretary. During this and the adjourned sessions of Monday and Tusday, sundry propositions were made and discussed relating to Education, Co-operation, sustaining Evangelists, &c., &c., of which there is no record. At the close of the meeting the Minutes being put into my hands with instructions to make out from them an article for publication in the Harbinger and Detector, I improve this my first leisure to submit the following:—

Copy of the "List of Congregations *in the State of Indiana, so far as reported for this meeting, with their location, bishops, and number of members.*

"The church at Cicero, Hamilton co.,			Samuel J. Pickerell, Bp.	No. 56
"	Hawk creek, Montgomery co.,		G. T. Harney, Henry Uterback,	68
"	Clarksburg, Decatur county,		S. M'Nary, J. H. Davis, and J. Conner,	122
"	Big Raccoon,	55		
"	Russelsville,	80		
"	South S. Rac.	25		
"	Badger's,	60	Putnam county,	440
"	Greencastle,	100		
"	Pleasant Garden,	60		
"	Caldwell's,	60		

The church in Ray township, Franklin co.,		James Curby,	50
" at Jamestown,	50		
" Big Raccoon,	50	Boone county,	114
" Alexander's,	14		
" Lewisburg, Hancock county,		R. Garrett,	
" " "		Benj. Legg,	30
" Crawfordsville, Montgomery co.,		A. M French,	
" " "		J. H. Graham,	
" " "		Francis Miller,	200
" " "	*Evang.*	John O'Kane,	
" Little Flat Rock, Rush county,		J.P.Thompson,	
" " "		B. F. Reeve,	
" " "		Peter Luney,	200
" " "		Henry Myers,	
" Mount Pisgah, Rush county,		North Parker,	45
" Republican, Marion county,		Stephen Crane,	
" " "		Clark Kitching,	16
" Flat Rock, Henry county,		E. Martindale,	
" " "		Geo. Corwine,	40
" Charleston,	195		
" Jeffersonville,	84		
" New Washington.	60		
" Silver Creek,	90	Clark county,	479
" Union,	15		
" Little Union,	35		
" Centreville, Wayne county,			60
" Deer Creek, Henry county,			15
" Mill Prairie, Clinton county.			40
" Coal Creek, Fountaine county,			
" Springville, Lawrence county,		Milton Short,	
" " "		Wesley Short,	90
" White River, "		Alexr. Kern,	
" " "		Abrm. Kern,	100
" Port William, "			25
" Gotherie's Creek, "		David Beck,	60
" Knob Creek, "		J. Bailey,	
" " "		J. Watson,	44
" Leatherwood, Lawrence county,		J. Hosletter,	
" " "		W. Newland,	100
" Salt Creek, Jackson county,		Robert Foster,	40
" Lost River, "		J. Hosletter,	
" " "		C. Hosletter,	
" " "		D. S. Lewis,	100
" Sulphur Creek,		G. W. Reynolds,	27
" Indian Creek, Green county,		John Nance,	
" " "		A. Gaddes,	40
" Indian Creek, Monroe county,		C. Kern,	
" " "		D. S. Smith,	
" " "		S. Cox,	80
" Eagle Creek, Boone county,		Wm. Guage,	
" " "		James Tanner,	60
" Mud Creek, Boone county,		James Shults,	
" " "		Z. Tanley,	
" " "		S. Downey,	35

The church at Bowling Green, Clay county,		J. J. Burton, D. Lane,	55
,, Christie's Prairie, Clay county,		T Crosby,	25
,, at Williamstown,	"	Job Combs, M. Combs,	50
,, Shaker's Prairie, Knox county,		Joseph Wolfe, Jacob Wolfe,	
	Evangs.	J.B.Hayward, W. Tichenor,	66
,, Palmer's Prairie, Sullivan county,		W. Ledgwood, R. Maxwell,	
	Evang.	A. P. Law,	80
,, at Yorktown, Delaware county,		T. Jones,	
	Evang.	John Langley,	30
(Scattering members in Delaware county, about 200,)			200
,, Rockville, Pike county,		P. E. Harris,	
	Evang.	John O'Kane,	42
,, Liberty, Marion county,			12
,, Noblesville, Hamilton county,		Isaac Hurlock, A. B. Cole,	129
,, at the Bluffs, Johnson county,		John L. Jones, Henry Brown,	40
,, Greensburg, Decatur county,	Elder Samuel Ellis,		40
	[in the county 200 or more,]		200
,, S. Fork of Coal creek, Fountaine co.		J. M. Brown, J H Applegate	25
,, Sycamore, Morgan county,		D. Spencer, J. Snodgrass,	40
,, Mount Vernon, 22			
,, Liberty, 38			
,, Union, 34	Posey county,		130
,, Yankee Settlement, 36			
,, Grant's creek, Grant county,			77
,, Indianapolis, Marion county,	Elder C. Butler,		80
,, Tosinah's Creek,			23
,, Vernon, Jennings county,		B. Owen, G W Branham H. New,	90
,, Spencer, 27			
,, Gosport, 139			
,, J. Brown's, 50			
,, Mill Grove, 70	Owen county,		524
,, Jordan, 8			
,, Raccoon, 30			
,, Dutch Settlement, 200			
,, Martinsville, Morgan county,		Benj. Sweet, Jas. Jackson,	58
,, Beaver Meadow, Rush county, 36		Drewry Holt,	
,, Little Blue River, 93		Moss Davis,	
,, Sugar Grove, 30		B. Sneider,	269
,, Addison's, 40		J. Addison,	
,, Concord, 70		Curtis Hall,	

The church at Burketts, Henry county,			23
,, Alexandria, Madison county,			60
,, Walnut Grove, Morgan county,			70
,, Bloomington, Monroe county,			40
,, Lake Settlement, Morgan county,			80
,, Six Mile, Henry county,			60
,, Lebanon, Warren county,	Levi Fleming, Danl. D. Hall,		100
,, (In churches in Hendrick's county, about 500,)			500
The church at New Lisbon, Henry county,	E. Shortridge, J. Shortridge,		50
,, the Forks of Clifty, Decatur county,	Z. Darnell,		23
,, Coffee Creek, Jennings county,	A. Hudson, Jesse Johnson		100
,, New Albany, Floyd county,	Nathaniel Price,		215
,, on Indian creek, Montgomery county,	John F. Jones, D G Pattenger H. Johnson,		40
,, at Hartsville, Bartholomew county,			12
,, Columbus, Bartholomew county,	Jos. Fassett, J. H. Terrell,		175
,, in Wayne township, Bartholomew county,	John Smith,		50
,, on Little Sand Creek, Bartholomew county,	W. D. Parker,		45
,, Clifty, Bartholomew county,	James M'Claskey,		60
,, at Edinburg, Johnson county,	William Irwin,		105
,, Nineveh, Johnson county,	Richard Gosney,		62
,, in Henley township, Johnson county,	William Barnes,		15
,, Union township, Johnson county,	John Mullis,		15
,, Connersville, Fayette county,	R. T. Brown,		100
,, on William's creek, Fayette county,	John Brown, —— Hazlett,		75
,, Hannah's creek, Union county,	—— Wilson,		75
,, at Fayetteville, Fayette county,	John Thomas,		30
,, on Ben Davis' creek, Rush county,	Jacob Daubenspeck,		75
,, Deer creek, Putnam county,	John Read, Geo. Piercy,		40
,, Eel River, Cass county,			40
,, Fall creek, Madison county,	Walter Kinnaman,		40
,, at Srader's, Fayette county,	Ellis and Srader,		50
,, on Little Walnut, Putnam county,	Levi Wright, N. Buchanan,		50
,, Mano creek, Knox county,	S. D. Piety, James Polk,		70
,, at Vincennes, Knox county,	Littleton Tims,		50
,, Bruceville, Knox county,	William Bruce,		50
,, New Lebanon, Sullivan county,			20
,, Indian Prairie, Sullivan county,			20
,, Scotland, Greene county,	Joseph Wilson, John Wilson,		30
,, Bloomfield, Greene county,			25

[Making a total of 115 churches, of 7701 members. Brother *J. B. Hayward*, who is now with us, reports a church on Prairie Creek—

another at Washington, Daviess county—each of 30 or more members; another, called Silver Creek Church, in Union county, of 60 members; and another on Elkhorn, of 20 members. You will perceive that no mention is made in the preceding list of the congregations in Jefferson, Laporte, Porter, and some other counties from which you have received and published accounts in the Millennial Harbinger. Probably not more than two-thirds were represented in this meeting.]

The following RECOMMENDATIONS were adopted very unanimously, to wit:—

"*Resolved*, That this Meeting recommend to the churches throughout the State of Indiana,

1st. That they send out faithful and intelligent brethren to labor as Evangelists in this State.

2d. That they make arrangements which may be relied on with certainty for the support of the brethren thus sent to labor.

3d. That the young preachers among us, and such brethren as are likely to become preachers, endeavor to obtain an education as extensive as they can, and that the churches assist them so to do.

4th. That they encourage a spirit of general education among them, that their children may be enlightened as extensively as possible, both in religion and science.

5th. That they patronize the Indiana State University at Bloomington, as far as convenient, in the education of their youth.

6th. That, in compliance with the request of the church at Crawfordsville, Montgomery county, there be a General Meeting of the brethren throughout this State in that place, to commence on Friday before the second Lord's day in June, A. D. 1840; when and where it is hoped that all the congregations will be represented, and from their communication a more perfect list taken."

[Thus far the record.]

A resolution was also unanimously adopted, requesting ELDER B. W. STONE to move to this State, should he find a location to please him; and promising all the aid that the brethren present could afford, to sustain him in commencing here the re-publication of his *Christian Messenger*.

The Christian meeting-house was generally filled to overflowing. On Lord's day the Methodist meeting-house was also opened and filled for Elder Stone. Some dozen or fifteen persons were immersed during the meeting; and on the last day four members re-united, who had for some while stood aloof from the congregation. On the whole, it was good to be there.

In the hope that the begun "reformation" will not retrograde; but progress by knowledge and goodness till the ancient spirit, the exercises and order of the first Christian congregations are fully restored, I subscribe myself, very respectfully and affectionately,

F. W. EMMONS.

TO A. CAMPBELL.

MIND WITHOUT RELIGION.

MIND, without religion, wanders through the universe, exiled, solitary, and as it were, lost; perceiving only a surface from which it is reflected, but finding no focus for its rays. In religion it finds a country; its light becomes a vivifying ray, instead of being a fugitive spark.—*Degerando.*

SCEPTICISM.

LETTERS TO B——, A SCEPTIC—*No. VI.*

ALLEGHENNY, PA., July 10, 1839.

My dear Friend,

I HAD filled my sheet of yesterday just as I had fairly begun. I have said that I will allow you to select the best specimens of human nature from the most refined nations, not modified by Christianity: I will allow you to go to Greece and Rome in their proudest days, and cull the finest and purest characters of classic memory; and, with all the embellishments that history and poetry have thrown around them, they were still but *poor benighted and depraved men.* In their researches after God and truth they are aptly represented by the Apostle Paul, in his address to the Athenians, as *men groping their way in the dark*——that "they might *seek* after God, if haply they might *feel* after him, and *find* him, though he is not far from every one of us." Whether, then, we regard the theology, the philanthropy, or the private morality of these men, they were poor drivellers! If you select Socrates, who has been styled by common consent, "The Prince of Philosophers;" what do we learn of him? In theology, he lived and died an idolator: the last command he delivered was to a friend to sacrifice a chicken to Æsculapius for him. As for his philanthropy, it extended little beyond the city of Athens. *Philanthropy*, with these ancient philosophers, implied the doing all in their power to strengthen and aggrandize their own *petty tribe;* and all in their power to pull down and destroy all surrouding nations: in fine, to treat with sovereign contempt all the world beside. The idea of a common origin, and a bond of common brotherhood, never entered their conceptions. Where did Mr. Owen learn his extensive benevolence? Where did he learn to say, "I am a citizen of the world"!" He learned it in his youth in the Christian school: he learned it from that system whose Author sent forth his servants with this command, "Go ye into *all the world*, and proclaim the glad tidings to *the whole creation:*" he learned it from that volume which ascribes to us a common parentage, and declares that "God has made of one blood *all nations* of men that dwell on the face of the whole earth." This extended philanthropy was wholly unknown to all nations till it was published by the Saviour of the world. Even the Jews, who had "the oracles of God," were as circumscribed in their philanthropy, as other nations. Indeed, their religious rites are in the New Testament compared to a "*wall*" separating them from the Gentiles; and language like this, concerning them, is ascribed to the Most High—"You only have I known of all the families of the earth." And the magic Seer of Pethor said, "Lo, the people shall dwell alone and shall not be reckoned among the nations." But the spirit of prophecy, in portraying the mission of the Messiah, 'the promised seed,' says, "*In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.*" The Most High says to him, "Ask of me, and I will give thee the *heathen* for thine inheritance, and the *uttermost parts of the earth* for thy possession:" yea, he says to him, "It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my

servant to raise up the house of David, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I have also set thee for a light to lighten the *Gentiles*, and that thou shouldest be for salvation to the ends of the earth." It is, then, from this fountain that every thing like universal benevolence has flowed: here Mr. Owen learned to say, "I am a citizen of the world."

But, to return to the ancients: They sometimes established what they called *republican* governments; but what were they? They were as perfect *despotisms* as ever existed. It is true the people chose their *rulers*, and these only held their power for a short term of years; but they had absolute power—they were the *tyrants* of the people. It remained for the Divine Lawgiver to disclose the prominent feature of true republicanism—viz. that the rulers were to be the *servants* of the people—"He that will be *great* among you, let him be the *servant* of all."

But when we turn to the social and private characters of these "lights of the world"—these "demigods of fame"—our souls turn away with abhorrence and disgust. And here I feel almost as one treading forbidden ground: I can scarcely divest myself of what I know to be a *false* and superstitious reverence for the sacredness with which succeeding ages have invested the names of Socrates, Aristotle, Zeno, Epictetus, and Plato. Historians in general have charitably concealed their faults and their vices; like Noah's sons, they have thrown a *mantle over their shame*. The spirit of charity would also prompt me to do likewise, did I not see the pernicious effects of this concealment. You have long since learned that it is much easier to *praise virtue* than to practise it, and that men may have *some* illustrious virtues, while they practise some enormous vices. Of this we find, in these men, a striking exemplification. I am willing to concede to these men *all* that belongs to them; yet I accord very little to the light of nature, or the light of reason: and it would be easy to show that whatever of correct views these men had, might have been derived by tradition from *Noah*, or by direct intercourse with the Jewish nation, or by access to their sacred records. We speak of the "light of reason," and we also speak of the "light of the eye." The expressions are both fitting enough: yet the man who should say, 'Blot out the sun, the moon, the stars, and extinguish the tapers, for we need them *not*—we have eyes to see with'—I say, this man would be pitied as a poor maniac. Nor less to be pitied, as an insane man, is he who says, 'Away with revelation, for we have *reason* to guide us.' Verily, this is the why we *need* revelation, as without *reason* revelation would be both unnecessary and useless; as *light* would be to us, if we had no eyes. But reason, without revelation, would be as dark as the eye without light; and *it* would thus be as dark as the hand or the foot. Thus, as the author of Ecclesiastes has said of the works of the Creator, "he has made all things double, one against another. He has made light for the eye, and the eye for light. He has made the air we breathe for our lungs, and our lungs for the air we breathe." To which we add, He has made our *reason* for revelation, and revelation for our reason. The Creator thus shows as much his *wisdom* and *goodness* in the *adaptation* of things, as in their separate creation and organization.

In all benevolence, yours, &c.

M. CLAPP.

UNIVERSALIAN DISCUSSION—*CLOSED.*

We expect from our readers an attentive perusal of the conclusion of the whole matter. Our *finale* is rather a synopsis of the ground covered on both sides; and from it any one of reflection may take a bird's eye glance of the basis of the hope of Universalism. The last letters, by agreement, were to appear simultaneously; and, consequently, mine is not a reply to Mr. Skinner's last, but a retrospect of those which preceded it. I trust such of the Universalian papers as only published a part of the controversy, will, at least, publish the concluding epistles. Some that have undertaken to give their own comments upon our side, instead of our own words, will not, I presume, now condemn themselves by suffering even my last letter to go to their readers. The guarantee of their honesty, already tendered us, we are sorry say will not allow us to expect even this must justice at their hands. A. C.

MR. SKINNER TO MR. CAMPBELL.

LETTER XXXIX.

UTICA, June 7th, 1839.

My dear Sir—AFTER a sojourn in the West Indies and South America, and an absence from home of nearly seven months, I have at length returned, and hasten to reply to your last letter, (38.) This letter really *deserves* no reply. I will therefore only remark on it. 1st. That I did *not* say in the slip in my paper of October last, that I had *delayed some weeks* in furnishing my manuscript letter in consequence of absence—for though I had been *absent* two or three weeks, there was *no letter* received from you *to answer*, till a very few days previous to my return—that I then wrote immediately, and sent you my letter in MS.—that I sent you a number of letters in MS.—that you never sent me *one* according to stipulation—that I was generally one and much of the time *two letters ahead of you*, and that the very dates of our letters for many months, show that you were far behind in time.

2. You ought to have analyzed brother L. C. Todd's letter, and informed your readers that the hard things he said purporting to be against *Universalists* in his renunciation, from which you quote so largely in Letter 34, he now confesses were aimed, not against *real Universalists*, but against "*nothingists*"—that though at the time my strictures on his renunciation were published, he "*believed*" that I abused him, yet that his "moral sensibilities had become so uncommonly and *unnaturally acute*," that what he then thought was the work of God in him, he has "since thought was a mistake" on his part!

3. You appear also not to have read the 18th, 19th, and 20th paragraphs of my Letter 37, or you could never have asserted that I had fairly abandoned my proof-texts on the ground of your challenge. My clear proof of Universalism from an exegetical view of those texts,

you pass over in total silence. And by quoting every text where Jesus spoke of *hell*, and all its parallels, from *three to six times*, you have got, to say the least, *twenty times more hell and damnation in your letters* than Jesus ever preached. Seriously, my dear sir, of what possible service to you do you suppose can be the quotation of those texts, over and over and over again, without the least comment, or any effort to show that they teach the withering doctrine of a vindictive God and an endless hell? I here make a few remarks on three or four of your strongest proof-texts.

4. The passages relative to the sin against the Holy Ghost, when correctly and literally rendered from the original, read thus:—Matt. xii. 32. "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this age nor the coming," [i. e. neither in this age of the law, nor the coming one of the gospel.] Mark iii. 29.—"Hath not forgiveness to the age, (*eis ton aiona*,) but is liable to age-lasting judgment," (or condemnation, Gr. *aionion krisis*.) And St. John says, 1 John i. 7. "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from ALL SIN." Therefore, these texts cannot support the doctrine of endless punishment. See Dr. A. Clarke's comments upon these texts.

5. The following paraphrase exhibits, I conceive, the true import of 2 Thess. 7–10. "And to you who are persecuted, rest with us, when the Lord Jesus, according to his oft-repeated warnings, shall be made manifest by Heaven, with his mighty angels, the Roman armies, the ministers of his righteous judgment upon this generation, (Matt. xxi. 41, 43.; xxii. 7.; xxiv. 34.) in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that, through wilful ignorance, know not God nor obey the gospel of Christ; who shall, as a nation of evil-doers, be punished with age-lasting destruction, far from their native land, and beloved city, and holy temple, where the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power by the Shekina, had for so many ages remained; when Christ shall come in the fulfilment of his predictions to be glorified and admired by his believing saints." 1 Peter iv. 18. "If the righteous believers with difficulty escape from Jerusalem and its coming woes, to what dreadful calamities shall the ungodly unbelievers be exposed?" See *your own* translation of the text. On the texts which speak of the power which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell, I made some explanatory remarks in my Letter (properly No. 5.) in June, 1837, which you have not attempted to refute.

6. I now proceed to review this entire discussion as briefly as possible. Passing over all preliminaries, such as the letters of "Spencer" and Montgomery, your admission of their premises but sweeping denial of their conclusions, your personal treatment of the latter, and professed desire of discussing with some great men, your neglect of opportunities at the East, your various artifices to evade the discussion of the main questions with me, in your first letters, &c., &c., let us see how the questions at issue have been disposed of, and what has been proved on either side. The first question reads thus: *Are* SHEOL, HADES, *and* GEHENNA, *or either of them, ever used in the Scriptures to express a place, or state, of endless misery?*

7. On this proposition it has been shown on my part, and you have admitted, that *sheol* in the Hebrew, and *hades* in the Greek, are exactly synonymous, the latter being the literal translation of the former. It

has also, I think, been clearly proved that these words signify, 1. Literally and commonly, the *grave* or the unseen state and condition of the dead in general, irrespective of their goodness or badness, their happiness or misery, and that good and bad men alike, all go to *sheol* or *hades*. 2. Figuratively, severe judgments, afflictions, sudden temporal destruction. 3. A distressing sense of guilt, remorse of conscience, great mental anguish—that David, Jonah, and others were in the depths of hell, in the lowest hell, (*hades*,) and were delivered therefrom. See Letter 5, paragraph 15. *Let this be remembered.*

8. It has been shown by Spencer, and more fully by me, and confirmed by the authorities not only of the Old and New Testaments, but of Josephus, Parkhurst, Macknight, Rosenmuller, Heylen, Winne, Wakefield, A. Clarke, Geo. Campbell, Schleusner, and finally by your own admission that *gehenna* originally and literally meant the Valley of Hinnom near Jerusalem—that it was afterwards used as a place of filth and offal, of dead carcases and worms, of continual fires kept up to destroy its filth, and as a place of the most horrible execution of criminals by burning alive. I have shown also that it was used in the Old Testament as an emblem of the dreadful judgments coming on the Jewish nation. See Letter 5, par. 18 to 22. Let. 7, p. 10 to 14. Let. 9, p. 5, and the 19th chapter of Jeremiah. *Let this be remembered.*

9. It has been shown that *gehenna* was never used by the Jews nor any others, till after the days of Josephus, to express punishment in the future state, unless Christ so used it—that there is no evidence that he did so use it, inasmuch as he never intimated any change of meaning in its use—never threatened any Gentile with it; and not one of the Apostles ever preached or even so much as *named gehenna* punishment at all, either to Jew or Gentile—that *gehenna* could not have been used as an emblem of a place of endless misery, unless such place had been previously revealed, or known to exist; but no such place or state had ever been revealed, consequently *gehenna* must be understood in the New Testament as in the Old.

10. You have admitted, denied, and re-admitted that neither *sheol*, *hades*, nor *gehenna* can of themselves prove the doctrine of endless misery—and conceded that *sheol*, or *hades*, including *tartarus*, is to be destroyed, and that *aionios*, your favorite term for endless, is never applied to the word *hell in any of its forms*. Letter 4, pp. 14, 27. *Let these be remembered.*

11. Having given up *sheol*, *hades*, and *tartarus*, you fix upon *gehenna and its adjuncts*, as proof of endless misery. You conceded that *gehenna* originally signified simply the Valley of Hinnom near Jerusalem, but maintained that its meaning was afterwards changed to signify a place of endless misery for the wicked, in the eternal world, and that it was never used in the New Testament except in this sense, or that it was never used there in its original and literal sense to represent the Valley of Hinnom. Letter 6, p. 19.; Let. 8, p. 12. I then quoted from, and subsequently published, the whole of your note on Matth. v. 22., in which you say that "the judges, the Sanhedrim, and the *hell* [*gehenna*] *fire*, here introduced, *are all human punishments*," and that the exposure to *gehenna-fire* was that of "being burned alive in the Valley of Hinnom." Letter 9, pp. 11, 12. You have been urged again and again to publish that note, but utterly decline doing it!

12. You next undertook to maintain that *gehenna* must mean a place of endless misery, not only from its adjuncts, but because it is contrasted with *life*, and being *cast into gehenna* is contrasted with *entering into life*, into the *kingdom of heaven*, &c. I showed clearly in answer, that *entering into life—into the kingdom of heaven*, &c. simply means entering into the gospel economy, into the Messiah's kingdom on earth, and consequently that endless misery could not be a proper counterpart thereto. I also quoted a note from your own pen on Matth. xi. 12., in which you show that the phrase "kingdom of heaven" means Messiah's reign on earth, and thus you were again made to refute yourself. *Let this be remembered.* Having failed of finding any proof of your views of *gehenna* in the Bible. you finally resorted to the Apocrypha and Targums for proof, when in fact *gehenna* does not once occur in all the Apocrypha, and the Targums are of no more authority than Mistress Babylon! Letter 12, p. 7, and Letter 13, p. 9. Thus ends your proof of the first proposition.

13. The *second* proposition reads thus: *Do the words* OLEM, AION, AIONIOS, &c., *when applied to the punishment of the wicked, mean duration without end?*

We both agree that *aion* and *aionios*, in Greek, express the same as *olem* in the Hebrew. You were to show that *aion* and *aionios*, when applied to punishment, express duration without end. This you undertook to do by referring to the roots or radical meaning of *aion-aei*, ever, and *on*, being. This position I showed to be untenable, 1st. By an examination of all the passages in the New Testament where *aei* occurs, and showing that it is *not once* used to express endless duration; and that *on*, as it only expresses *being*, without any reference to duration, cannot add to the extent of duration expressed by *aei*. Letter 12, pp. 6, 7. 2d. By showing that *olem* in the Hebrew, and *aion* and *aionios* in the Greek, were often applied to things of limited and even short duration, such as priesthood, covenant, &c.—that *aion*, instead of expressing *endless being*, simply expresses *continuity* or *continuous being*, without any necessary reference to its duration—that it is used to express age, period, dispensation, world, course, &c.—that it is often used in the plural, and even in the double plural, as its most intensive form—that it is never rendered *eternity*, and cannot consistently be so rendered—that we read of the *past aions, future aions*, of the *ends of the aions*, &c. All these facts have been shown not only on the authority of Parkhurst, Stuart, Wakefield, Macknight, Scarlett, Ewen, and Clarke, but by the Bible itself. *Let this be remembered.* 3d. By your own incontrovertible authority, quoted in Letter 31, pp. 6, 7, (and published entire in the Magazine and Advocate,) from Table 14 of the Appendix to your New Testament, where you define *aion* thus: "*Age, aion*, (derived from *aei*, always, and *on*, being. Its radical idea is *indefinite duration. We read of the end of aion five times in Matthew*," &c, &c. See your whole note, which you *must* father while you live. *Let this be remembered.*

14. It has been shown, Letter 2, page 16, and Let. 11, pp. 22, 15, that *aionios* cannot express more than *aion*, the substantive from which it is derived, and that neither *aion* nor *aionios* is ever used to express endless duration at all, unless the subject necessarily requires it. It has also been shown, Letter 11, pp. 13, 14, and Let. 15, pp. 15, 18,

that the phrase *eternal life*, which occurs more than forty times in the New Testament, is almost always, if not uniformly, used to designate, not the immortal and endless bliss of heaven, but the continuous and spiritual peace, joy, and consolation of believers in this life. And to put the matter beyond all dispute, I have shown that the inspired writers spoke of *periods of longer duration than aion and aionios*, where God is said to reign "*from aion to aion, and farther*,"—the saints to shine "*through the aions, and farther*,"—to "walk in the name of the Lord *through the aion, and beyond it*"—and that Paul spoke of a glory *exceeding aionios by an excess*—"*a far more* (or *excessively*) *exceeding aionion weight of glory.*" See Letter 1, p. 20; Let. 21, p. 15, which triumphant proof on my part, you nor any man in the universe can answer. *Let these things be remembered.*

15. As *aion* and *aionios* are so frequently used in scripture in a limited sense; I called on you to show why they must necessarily have the sense of *endless* in the very few places where the scriptures apply them to punishment—to show what there is in the nature, character, or design of punishment which requires this sense—whether punishment has its root and foundation in God—whether it was an *end* originally designed by him, or only a *means* to an end; and showed that, if it were a *means to an end, it could not be endless.* Letter 1, pp. 16, 21, 22; Letter 11, p. 16; Let. 15, pp. 19, 20; Let. 17, pp. 15–18; Let. 21, pp. 17–21. You have given no answer, nor attempted to show that punishment must be endless, either from its *nature*, *design*, or *end*. *Let this be remembered.* I then gave *ten* insuperable reasons why punishment could *not* be endless—because it would be utterly *useless, pernicious, dishonorable to God, opposed to his benevolence, his mercy, his wisdom, his power, his justice, his veracity, and the unequivocal voice of revelation.* The only thing ever advanced against those arguments, was the oft-repeated and unsupported *assertion*, that if present evil, or suffering, or limited punishment be compatible with the attributes of God, endless evil, endless punishment, must be equally so! Thus confouunding, or forgetting the vast difference between *means* and *ends*. As well might you affirm that if nauseous medicines are ever necessary, people should live on them altogether! Thus endeth the second proposition.

16. The *third* proposition reads thus: *Is there any word in human language that expresses duration without end, which is not applied to the future punishment of the wicked, or which can certify us that God, angels, or saints shall have duration without end?* In proof of the affirmative of this proposition, I have adduced *ten* Greek words, which, either as adjectives, signify strictly, literally, and simply, *endless*, or else, either as adjectives or substantives, embrace that idea in connexion with others, such as *undying, indissoluble, indestructible, immortal, imperishable, pure, incorruptible;* neither of which is ever applied to punishment. See Letter 1, pp. 11–16; Let. 17, pp. 20–23; Let. 19, pp. 7–15; Let. 21, p. 13. Several of these words I have shown are applied in scripture to God, to life, and to a future state of happiness, and all of them could be properly so applied; while not one of them is ever applied in scripture to punishment or misery of any kind, here or hereafter, or to any other subject of a mere earthly character, or limited duration.

27. You made a great parade and pretended a great triumph over me, because I introduced *aidios* (but *one* out of the ten words adduced) in

proof of this proposition. You contended that *aei* was the root, and only root, of *aidios*, that gave to it the sense of *endless*; and therefore, that while it proved my third proposition, it also virtually proved the second one in your favor. But how this could be, you have not shown; for *aidios was not included among the words of the second proposition*. But you would fain have the reader believe it was, because derived from the same root. I then showed that it had another still more important root in *dios*, divine, which is used without any change of form for the two last syllables of *aidios*, and that *ever-divine*, or *ever*, combined with the *name of God*, must be far more expressive of perpetuity than *ever* (*aei*) alone. If the first part is from *aei*, the last part is as certainly from *dios*. I also showed that, even granting it to have no other significant part but *aei*, as you contend, its sense of endless must be derived rather from its *usage* than merely from the force of *aei;* 1st. Because *aei* in the eight times it occurs in the New Testament, *never once signifies endless*. 2d. Because numerous texts and the highest authority in the literary world, prove that *aion* and *aionios*, the other two derivatives from *aei*, are much oftener used to express a limited or indefinite, than an infinite period. And 3d. By *your own definition of aion*, copied from your Appendix to the New Testament. Thus your defeat here, and that on the highest authority, was as signal as it was when you denied that *sempiternus* is compounded of *semper* (always) and *æternus*. See Letter 22, p. 4; Let. 23, p. 5; Let. 24, p. 3; and Let. 31, p. 3. *Let these things be remembered.*

18. You once said you left me hanging upon the skirts of Kneeland and Scarlett. But how in the name of common sense I could hang upon the skirts of men whom I merely referred to as expressing a different opinion from your own, and at the same time *expressed my entire dissent from their opinion*, (see Letter 21, p. 10, &c.) I am wholly unable to perceive.

19. Having refuted all you could advance in favor of endless misery from the force and meaning of *sheol*, *hades*, *tartarus*, *gehenna*, *olem*, *aion*, and *aionion*, with all your array of *adjuncts*, *contrasts*, and *antitheses*, and given you *ten* words in proof of my third proposition, and yourself conceding it proved, I then proceeded to the 4th proposition, which reads thus: *Shall eternal life* (meaning thereby endless holiness and happiness) *be, according to the scriptures, the ultimate destiny of all mankind?*

20. I proved the affirmative of this proposition 1, from the acknowledged and scripturally proved attributes of God, by inductive and logical reasoning and arguments, which you have made no efforts to refute. The premises being indisputable, (excepting that you denied the infinite goodness of God, a thing which I never before knew a Christian to do!) I clearly showed that the greatest good of the whole and every part of the universe, or final universal holiness and happiness, must result therefrom, and could alone be reconciled with the allowed attributes of God. These arguments were sustained by numerous clear testimonies of scripture. The only thing bearing the semblance of argument against my reasoning and conclusions, was an unsupported assumption, as void of consistency as if you were to affirm that because human beings are weak, helpless infants, when born into the world, they will remain so through life; or because we now have bodies of flesh and blood, we must eternally have the same; or because none are per-

fectly happy now, therefore none will ever in eternity be perfectly happy!

21. I then proved the final holiness and happiness of all men, 2d, from the character, advent, labors, and doctrine of Christ, as predicted in the Old Testament, and more fully laid down in the New, and showed that these could not be reconciled with any other doctrine, by quoting and referring to more than seventy passages of scripture, expressing his titles, such as the seed of the woman which was to bruise the serpent's head, the Heir of all things, the Saviour of the world, &c. &c., showing also that all he said, all he did, all he suffered, all he taught, and all that his followers taught of him, represented him as a complete and universal Saviour.

22. In the 3d place, I showed by the testimony of more than eighty passages of scripture, bearing directly and indirectly on the subject, that all men will finally be saved—that this was God's will, pleasure, and purpose—that he worketh all things after the counsel of his own will—that his counsel shall stand—that he hath given all to Christ for this purpose—that Christ shall most surely accomplish the same—that we are commanded to pray for all, and that too, in faith—that God hath promised the salvation of all men, or to bless all nations, families, and kindreds of the earth, in the seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, spoken of it by the mouth of all his holy Prophets since the world began, promised that all the ends of the world, all the kindreds of the nations, shall come and worship before him and glorify his name—that every knee shall bow, and every tongue confess in the name of Christ to his glory—that Christ died for all, for every man, and shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied—shall draw all men unto him—take away the sin of the world, enlighten every man, write his law in every heart—all shall know God—his grace and righteousness shall abound much more than sin—sin shall be finished, an end made of transgression, the devil and his works, and death, and every thing that bears its name, or can produce pain or sorrow, shall be destroyed—that every creature in the universe of God shall bless his name forever, and the reconciled world be by Christ delivered up to God the Father, and God be all in all. The clear and ample testimony of these four-score passages of scripture, you allowed to pass almost without a comment! I therefore regard the doctrine of universal salvation as triumphantly and incontrovertibly established.

23. You have been incessantly engaged in trying to draw me off from this great and glorious topic, to various other minor and wholly irrelevant subjects—you have employed sarcasm and buffoonery, and conjured up many caricatures of my doctrine, in order to excite ridicule for my opinions, and contempt for myself. You contend zealously for the doctrine of *antithesis*, Letter 16, p. 9, and allow, p. 11, that the *all men* used in Romans v. 18, 19, and 1 Cor. xv. 22, are used antithetically in the two parts of each verse. And when I adduce them as proof that as certainly as *all men* are under the judgment of condemnation and die in Adam, the earthly man, so certainly shall *all* receive justification unto life, and be made alive in the heavenly man, you make no reply, but tacitly concede the fact. I am convinced, sir, that you do not yourself believe the horrid dogma of endless damnation. *Ask your own conscience the question!*

24. Four times I have earnestly called on you to publish (as I have done) your own notes from your New Testament, on Matth. v. 22, and on the Greek *aion*, in which your principal criticisms in this discussion are completely refuted; and *you dare not do it!* I expect, as a matter of course, judging from the past, that, in your closing letter, you will rage against me, vaunt a triumph, and boast a complete victory! But our readers will know perfectly well how to understand you; and if, after reading it, they will re-peruse this letter, and compare the points and references here named, with the discussion throughout, they will be satisfied of the strict truth of all I here state. I rejoice in the happy termination of this discussion. I rejoice that it has been had—that it has appeared in your paper, and is to go into the hands of a Bible Society—a noble field for usefulness.

25. In conclusion, sir, permit me to say, that I attribute your defeat in this discussion, not to any merit, or talents, or learning of my own; for I do not claim, and never have claimed, but a small share of either; not to your want of learning, or talents, for probably few men in this country can lay claim to higher than you are said to possess. And I here acknowledge my obligations for the great assistance your learning, talents, and reputation have been to me in this discussion. The valuable notes to which I had access in your New Testament, written in coolness and deliberation long before this discussion was thought of, and when truth alone seemed to be your aim, have been of inestimable service to me and to the truth, in refuting the untenable and extravagant positions you have taken in this controversy, under the influence of passion and prejudice.

26. I attribute your defeat partly to your ignorance of the doctrine you opposed; partly to your losing your temper and getting into such paroxysms of wrath; partly to the absurdity and monstrosity of your *own doctrine*—a doctrine you cannot pray to have true. But your defeat is mainly owing, as I predicted at the close of my second letter, to the strength and power of that everlasting truth, against which your weapons were aimed—a system which has in its favor the united voice of reason, philosophy, and revelation—which has heaven and earth, God, angels, and saints in its favor—for which all good beings in the universe pray, and for which even you yourself, in your sober hours, are constrained to pray and wish it true. Quench not the Spirit, my brother. And may God (who I think is at least as good as you are) grant this good desire of both our hearts, sanctify this discussion to general edification, and bless the world with a knowledge of his truth *and salvation* forever.

Yours in all affection and faithfulness,

D. SKINNER.

Mr. Campbell to Mr. Skinner.

LETTER XL.

MR. SKINNER:

Sir—I ONLY design, in my concluding epistle, a condensed recapitulation and review. This controversy originated with your party. My place throughout has been that of a respondent. You commenced: I close. You have had all the advantages you asked.

You solicited a *written*, rather than an *oral* discussion. You led the way. You selected *four propositions*. You asked for *twenty letters*, of six octavo pages each, and finally you asked for your last to be extended to eight. To all these demands I consented, Letter vi., par. 6.

2. I chose the affirmative of two; the first of which was, "*Sheol, Hades, and Gehenna are sometimes used to denote a future state of misery or of punishment.*" You conceded this. I sought and gained two points by this concession:—1st. That Gehenna, or *Hell*, does not simply mean guilt, repentance, or present anguish of any sort; therefore present pain or agony does not absorb the full meaning of Hell, and is not the proper punishment of sin. 2d. That inasmuch as *Hell* sometimes denotes punishment after death, the nature and extent of that punishment, if not clearly indicated by the term itself, may be learned from the adjectives connected with that word, or from the terms substituted for it in the sacred style. This makes the discussion of *aioon* and *aioonios*, generally rendered *everlasting*, interesting.

3. But your having associated *Gehenna* with words of a different class, and confounded it with them, obliged me to make it the subject of special investigation. My purpose here was to show, that in the New Testament the word *Hell* does positively denote endless punishment. I showed by a full induction of all its occurrences in that volume, that, in the lips of Jesus and his Apostle, it did undoubtedly denote a place or state of endless punishment. Here your plea and defence was, that it was anciently among the Jews the name of a place of temporal and limited punishment—the vale of Hinnom; and therefore could not possibly mean in the New Testament a place of interminable woe. You, indeed, wounded your defence by conceding that generally, if not universally in the New Testament, it is not used in its original and literal, but in a figurative sense. But that which fully annihilated your argument was the fact, that all the words used in the New Testament to express the endless bliss of the righteous, were in the Old Testament, and originally, like *Gehenna*, or *Hell*, applied to temporal places and things. Such was *Shemim*, translated *Heaven*, *Jerusalem*, *Mount Zion*, *Paradise*, &c. *Heaven* originally denoted the air. Thus the fowls of heaven, the fowls of the air, that fly in the midst of heaven, or in the air, &c. *Paradise* denoted the delightful, but transient abode of primitive man. *Jerusalem*, *Mount Zion*, represented earthly cities. Our argument from these incontrovertible facts, then, was—If these words, originally and literally indicative of earthly and temporal glory and bliss, came in the New Testament to be the types and names of future and endless glory and felicity, why should it be objected that Gehenna, or Tophet, or Hell fire did originally mean earthly and temporal punishment; and for that reason cannot mean in the New Testament endless punishment? Here it was demonstrated that if your logic was good against Hell, it was equally good against Heaven—that it equally annihilated the eternity of both. This plain argument you never attempted to dispose of—indeed, it never was disposed of, and never can be by any man.

4. But we supported our affirmative concerning *Gehenna* by positive and direct proofs. We exhibited its substitutes and contrasts as taken from the lips of Jesus. These stereotyped its meaning. For the word *Hell*, as its fair equivalent he substitutes the words "*everlasting fire*,"

Matth. xviii. 8, 9. "Being cast into hell," he explains by going into the "*fire that shall never be quenched.*" He does this three times in one discourse. Mark ix. 43—48. Again, he contrasts, "entering into life" with being "cast into hell." Matth. x. 28.; xviii. 8, 9.; Mark ix. 43; and "entering into the kingdom of God with one eye," he contrasts with being "cast into hell with two eyes, where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." Your defence here bordered on the ridiculous. When I quoted the words, "Fear Him who, when he has killed the body, has power to destroy both soul and body in Hell," you said it meant, "fear Cesar, who has power to destroy you in the siege of Jerusalem," or something thereunto equivalent; and "entering into life" you said was "joining the church." But your courage finally failed to defend these dread alternatives—as being too preposterous for even your own sense of the ridiculous. Thus my affirmation that the term *Gehenna* or *Hell*, in the New Covenant, does certainly mean a state of endless punishment, is fully sustained and stands in unbroken strength after you have discharged your whole artillery against it.

5. The first proposition sustained, the controversy was legitimately closed, so far as the truth of your entire system is concerned. For if it be proved, that *Hell* in the New Testament means "endless punishment," where "both soul and body after death are destroyed;" and if it be proved that the wicked shall be cast into it, all the sons of Adam will never by any other arguments or cavils erase from the Christian religion endless destruction for the wicked. Still you would have me prove it a second time, and gave me the following proposition—"All the force of the Hebrew *olem* is transferred into the Greek *aioon*, and into the adjective *aioonios;* which words, when applied to the future state of both the righteous and the wicked, does denote duration without end." You concurred with me that *aioonios* had in it the full force of *olem* and *aioon*, and was almost universally translated *forever, eternal, everlasting*, &c. You also admitted that when applied to the future bliss of the righteous, it indicated *without end*; but denied that it had the same meaning when applied to the misery of the wicked.

6. My first argument, and it certainly is a common sense argument, was—That *everlasting*, when in the same breath and by the same speaker, it was applied to the future bliss of the righteous, and to the future misery of the wicked, must, in all honesty and fair dealing, mean the same thing. To escape from the force of this most palpable argument, you were obliged to take new ground, to assume, that the word has no certain meaning in itself, but derives all its sense from the word with which it is connected. You made it a perfect cipher. Thus you make *Hell* depend upon *eternal*, and *eternal* upon *Hell* for their meaning! Neither of them alone mean any thing certain; but when together, you assume, they mean temporal punishment!

7. By various elaborate inductions we showed that by every law and custom of language this word did clearly express "*being without end*"—"*always being.*" But when used in reference to mundane things, as it often is, it must be used figuratively and indefinitely. And when applied to a spiritual and future state, it must be taken in its natural and full import. Thus it is applied to God, when his simple and perpetual existence is spoken of. It is also applied to his glory

and praise with regard to continuity, and to the future bliss of the righteous. Now in reference to mundane things, we are uniform in our interpretation: we always use the word as indicative of some indefinite long time. And in reference to a future and spiritual state, we are equally uniform in always using the term as indicative of endless duration. Such is the oracle of reason, as well as the laws of interpretation. But you violate these principles by making it, in reference to the same state or dispensation, mean two different things. For example, there is in reference to one spiritual state an "everlasting covenant" of the "everlasting God," concerning an "everlasting righteousness," an "everlasting redemption," an "everlasting inheritance," an "everlasting life," and an "everlasting punishment," always expressed by the same word in all languages. Now to make it six times out of seven occurrences, in relation to the same institution, mean *endless* and once *ending*, is what we call absolute tyranny and despotism, according to all the laws and canons of language and interpretation. This, sir, is your presumptuous position in this branch of the controversy. When asked, Does the word ever mean *endless*? you answer, Yes; but then you say "the subject fixes the meaning to the word, and not the word to the subject." But when again asked, What better than the accompanying epithet fixes the meaning of the subject? you gave no answer. You virtually make the substantive explain the adjective, and then make it explain itself. Singular positions require singular rules and laws of evidence and proof.

8. The sum of my argument on these words I now quote from Letter xiv., par. 23:—'The words *aioon*, *aioonios*, occur in the Greek Old and New Testament some *six hundred and eighteen times;* of which extraordinary sum they are properly and literally translated in the common version *five hundred and eight times by the strongest terms in human speech indicative of endless duration*—such as 'eternal,' 'everlasting,' 'forever;' and, in the judgment of the most numerous and learned critics, might as well in many of the others have been as literally translated by the same words. Then look, in the second place, at the special fact: These said terms occur in the New Testament alone; referring to the *continuance* of the happiness of the righteous, *sixty-one times;* and to the *continuance* of the punishment of the wicked *fifteen times*, translated 'eternal,' 'everlasting,' 'forever.' Now, from the general fact, and this still more striking special fact, I emphatically, and with intense interest, demand why—for what reason—by what law of language or canon of criticism, shall the *duration* of the happiness of the righteous and of the misery of the wicked be as different as time and eternity, when they are thus so often, and in such various circumstances, set forth by the very same words! On the answer to this question must always hang the fate of Universalism, so far as the meaning of these words is concerned.' Again, paragraph 25, 'To sum up this branch of the argument—we have, from your own display of *aei*, always, and *oon*, being, shown that no word, etymologically or radically, can more naturally signify *endless being* or *endless duration*. That *ever*, *forever*, *evermore* and *eternal*, are its most common versions in both Testaments. You have examined the New, and conceded this. I have examined both Old and New, and if it is disputed I will reinforce it; but I think you will not demand this. When applied to

God's being, you admit it means endless. Also, when applied to his glory, it means duration without end. Also, when applied to the praises to be offered to him. And you also admit that when it is applied to the future happiness of the righteous, it means endless. Now for your reasons why it signifies a limited time, an ending period, when expressive of the continuance of the punishment of the wicked.'

9. Your escape from this I shall now give in your own words, Letter xv., paragraph 14.—"We are not in dispute whether *aioon* and *aioonios* are ever used to signify endless duration. I not only concede, but argue, that when applied to God and his perfections, they necessarily have this meaning—and that from the very nature of the subject. And were you to find them 6000 instead of 600 times, in their various forms and flexions, in the Old and New Testaments, and out of that number 5900 times applied to God and his perfections; yet if, in the other hundred, they were applied to a variety of things of *short duration*, and which, from their nature could not be endless, you would not have gained one step towards establishing endless punishment from the force of them, unless you proved by something else that punishment must be endless." The conclusion of your philological labors then, is, that we must prove punishment to be *endless* by something else than language: for you now admit that language cannot do it. Why, then, may we not ask, have you selected three propositions about words, when the words of inspiration can never settle the matter! Your *a-priori* views of what is fitting the Deity, disprove all that inspired language can express in its clearest, most definite, and precise terms and phrases.

10. Having assumed the absurd position that language could not prove punishment to be everlasting, because there is not one word in the universe that always means the same thing; asserting also that although we proved *aioonios* to mean duration without end sixty times for once it was used indefinitely, it availed nothing, since it was not always so used; therefore something else than the import of substantives or adjectives must prove it: I say, notwithstanding all this, you proceed to your third proposition, and affirm that *there is a word in human language that signifies duration without end never applied to the future punishment of the wicked;" nor to the righteous*, you might have said.

11. This is at first view rather a startling proposition to some of the more sagacious Universalists, inasmuch as it is admitted on all hands—by Turk, Jew, Christian, Infidel, Universalist and all—that the belief of eternal punishment pervaded the human race before the Christian era, and contemporary with it. Now if the Saviour and his Apostles were Universalists, they were not only unwise in throwing away their lives for nothing, inasmuch as God could in his very nature but save all his creatures without their martyrdom: I say, they were not only foolishly prodigal of suffering and of life, but they are censurable for not using the most unambiguous terms in disabusing the world of "Particularism;" which they did not, if the third proposition be true: for it seems there was at least one word that denoted duration without end, which they never used to indicate the future state of righteous or wicked; thus leaving the matter at least ambiguous, if the other words used by them did not unequivocally decide its character. But they did

not on the hypothesis before us; for if you admit that the words often associated with future punishment indicate endless duration, which words, as honest men, they ought on no account to have used, when opposing an error so universal as the nature of endless misery in that age. There are words in the language that clearly indicate things *temporal;* and certainly if eternal was inapplicable to punishment, they could, as they should, have found the term *temporal* or the equivalent, and always applied it to the future punishment of the wicked.

12. It was, however, on this third proposition that you proved to all men your profound ignorance of the language in which you were acting the critic. Your gross mistakes and blunders showed that when the burthen of proof lay on you, you sometimes did not know what was for or against your own side: for when your argument was summed up, it was an unequivocal confirmation of my proof of the second position. It is a fact, which all the learned world, without a single exception, will admit—that Mr. Skinner, in his dissertations upon *aeidios*, &c. did, without intending or knowing it, prove my propositions and disprove his own; boastingly affirming that he had found a word which did signify duration without end; which word, in its true etymological meaning and construction, was identical with that very word in my second proposition, which himself had immediately before declared did not absolutely mean duration without end. The apparent recklessness of truth in this instance was much more to be regretted than the fatal blunder itself—in affirming that the root of the one word implied *limited*, and that of the other *endless* duration; while, in truth, both words had the same identical root. So ended the debate on the three first propositions. To quote my words on that occasion, Letter xx., paragraph 15.—'You have now finished the controversy on the philology of Universalism, as I before said, in favor of the truth, far beyond all that I expected. You have said that *aidios* is that word which signifies absolute endless duration; that had it been prefixed to punishment, it would have made it absolutely endless and interminable. In thus deciding you have refuted yourself and all your efforts to explain away both *aei* and *aeioon;* for it is incontrovertibly certain that *aeidios* derives all its endless duration from *aei*, and that *aioonios* and *aidios* are branches from the same root. You have then, sir, sustained my proof of the first two propositions, by sealing my facts and reasonings upon those long disputed words; and you have in another way established all my positions in contending for the absolute eternity indicated by this word; for it is applied to the punishment of the wicked and to God, and to nothing else in the Bible.' We have then, in one word, shown that your proof of the third proposition is a corroboration of my proof of the second—you demonstrating that *aei* found in composition, whether in *aioonios*, *aeidios*, or *aternus*, *ayternity*, or *eternal*, means *endless* in its fullest import. This unexpected favor, however, not being in your intention, but in the fact and result of your criticism, entitles you not to our thanks.

13. The main proposition, the jet of the whole controversy, is your fourth. You affirm that "*eternal life*" (meaning holiness and happiness) "*shall be the ultimate destiny of all mankind.*" This, of course, was to be proved not *a-priori*, not by far-fetched inference, but from Bible statements. But, 1st. You did not quote one text which affirm-

ed the ultimate holiness of all mankind. 2d. You did not quote a text that affirmed the ultimate happiness of all mankind. 3d. But you did cite sundry passages pertaining to the Messiah's kingdom, its extension and comprehension, its temporal, spiritual, and eternal blessings; from which you first *inferred* the individual salvation, and next inferred the individual holiness of all men. From such texts as, "All souls are mine,"—"I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance,"—"Look unto me and be saved, all ends of the earth,"—"He will draw all men to him," &c. &c.—you infer eternal life as the portion of every human being. But inasmuch as the question about the final end of all flesh was not the point before any of the writers you quote, your application of their words beyond their intention is a downright misapplication and perversion.

14. In exposing this presumptuous daring, my method was first—to give the direct testimony of Enoch, Abraham, Moses, Joshua, David, Isaiah, Jeremiah, the Baptist, the four Evangelists, Paul, Peter, James, Jude, and the Lord Jesus declaring that it should not finally "be with the wicked as with the righteous:"—that the *end of all wicked men is destruction*—"whose END is destruction"—"everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power:"—that "a much sorer punishment than death awaited them who disobeyed the Lord"—"of how much sorer punishment shall he be thought worthy, who has despised" Christ's salvation.

15. In the second place, we showed that it was contrary to the style of the New Testament:—that that volume declares "it is appointed to men once to die; but after this the judgment:"—that "God has appointed a day in which he will judge the world by Jesus Christ righteously:"—that he will "render to every man according to his works"—"to them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory, honor, immortality, he will bestow eternal life;" and "to those who do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, he will award indignation and wrath"—nay, that he will dispense "tribulation and anguish to every soul of man that doeth evil"—"in the day" when "all shall appear before the judgment seat of Christ"—"when he will judge the secrets of all men according to Paul's gospel:"—that after this judgment, he that is found "unjust, unrighteous, or unholy, shall be so *still*:"—that "those only whose names are in the book of life shall enter the holy eternal city:"—that "without that city there are dogs, sorcerers, liars, murderers," &c. &c.—that "they only are blessed who keep his commands; for they shall have right to the tree of life, and shall enter the gates of the city"—"who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect!" &c. From all of such sayings, of which there are innumerable hosts, two ultimate and opposite fates are as certainly allotted to men, as there are two sorts of men in this world.

16. In the third place, we challenged you, time after time, to select only one verse of all your alleged proofs, and form a close and logical issue upon it. But you declined it to the last letter. You *could* give scores, you said; but *would* not give one.

17. We, in the fourth place, alleged texts on which we would rest the whole matter; but you would not meet us on these. For instance: One verse on which we laid the greatest emphasis—a verse, too, which alone overcame all the doubts of Tholluck, one of the most

learned of German Divines, and silenced all his scepticism, was never so much as noticed by you. You had the caution to pass it in profound silence. It is this: "The sin against the Holy Spirit *has no forgiveness, neither in this world nor in that which is to come—neither in the present nor future state.*" In all your daring assertions, you had the prudence to let this pass unnoticed.

18. We showed also, in the fifth place, that there are three distinct salvations stated in the sacred writings:—1st. That of *the body* from temporal evils; in which sense "God is the saviour of all men." 2d. That of *the soul* from sin: "*Who hath saved us* and called us"—"He hath saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewal of the Holy Spirit," &c. &c. 3d. That there will be a future salvation of *the whole human person:* "Now is your salvation nearer than when you believed"—"The day is at hand"—"He will appear a second time to their salvation that look for him." To this you paid no attention; but continued to apply the word without any regard to this important fact; and thus, despite of these palpable facts and differences you apply to the last whatever is said of the first or of the second salvation.

19. Meanwhile, you thought it more expedient to give us theological dissertations on the Divine perfections, than to rely so much upon direct quotations. The sum of these dissertations was—that, according to your optics and notions of what became the Ruler of the Universe, it would be out of the question to punish sin with an endless punishment:—that, to perpetuate misery in his dominions was most abhorrent to your notions of Divine benevolence, mercy, justice, &c. It was also equally dishonorable to the wisdom and power of God, whose wisdom is omniscience and whose power is omnipotence to permit such a state of things to continue long. Such was the point and burthen of several of your letters. To which it was replied—

20.—1st. That all arguments drawn from the Divine perfections, from the wisdom, power, goodness, justice, mercy, &c. of God, in favor of the necessity of an ultimate termination of sin and suffering, would equally have forbid the possibility of its existence at all: for if the Divine perfections *must* bring it to an end, they *ought* never to have suffered it to commence: for *prevention* is altogether wiser and more benevolent than *cure*. Your hypothetical reasonings on the Divine perfections are perfectly refuted by the *fact* that moral evil and physical pain are as old as this creation; and if God is immutable in all his perfections, as far as human reason knows, it may be compatible with the Divine perfections to permit the continuance of it to a period indefinite as eternity itself. God was righteous, merciful, and kind—as wise and powerful the day that sin and sorrow were born, as he is now, or ever will be. It is therefore preposterous to argue from any *speculative* views of the Divine perfections against what the scriptures affirm—against what God may, or may not do, in reference to sin and sinners. What he has done and is now doing is a specimen of what may be done under his wise and benevolent administration, our speculations to the contrary notwithstanding.

21. But, in the second place, as persons standing upon the circumference of a circle, some 90 or 100 degrees apart, will contemplate a central column in a different light, if not under a different angle; so I, from my views of the Divine perfections, arrive at conclusions very contrary to yours. Moral evil there is—pain and misery there are.

These are facts. To put them down, and prevent their recurrence, we are sure is within the designs of Divine benevolence. But we see Divine benevolence fails here in innumerable instances. The gospel itself becomes a savor of condemnation to the lost. The most hardened wretches are found sitting under the very offer of holiness and eternal life. Now you admit that these miscreants would torment any pure society in the universe. Well, "they die in their sins." Now, to treat them as the pure in heart, and to receive them into Abraham's bosom as they are, we have showed would be supremely cruel and unmerciful. Every Divine attribute requires their separation—in one word, their everlasting punishment. Here, then, your *theology* was showed to be as fallacious as your *philology*.

22. In this dilemma you bethought yourself of a third region, and of a new dispensation; and not finding, like many Universalists, a saviour in death, a purgatorial efficacy in the single act of dying, you, all at once, discovered an intermediate prison, or purgatorial institution for disembodied spirits—not for *men*, but for the spirits of men. In this poetic region, Hell fire, or Gehenna punishment, becomes the sanctifying agency; and those whom the tears and blood of Christ on earth assailed in vain, are cured by fire and brimstone.

23. Having made this splendid discovery, scarcely had you descended from your Pegasus, returning from this *Limbo patruum*, than the earth-borns troubled you with many hard questions. To relieve them you set about the institution of a new system of philosophy founded upon your theological dissertations, and a new theory of man.

24. The principle points in the new philosophy, as we exposed them, are:—1st. That *after death punishment* is, of all means of grace, the most effectual and irresistible. It is, indeed, omnipotent and irresistible grace: for it saves all the hardened wretches that the love of God and grace of Christ have assailed in vain. 2d. All punishments are only grace in the form of chastisement for the exclusive benefit of the chastised. 3d. All the inhabitants of "*Hell fire punishment*," or this purgatorial prison, cease sinning the moment they are incarcerated, else they never could be discharged. 4th. "God punishes every sinner according to the full demerit of his sins," and then the prison doors are opened. 5th. Sin is finite in all its consequences, and cannot possibly require punishment infinite in duration. 6th. The same law that condemns will also justify the same person; and, 7th. finally punishment will destroy itself.

25. In reply to this philosophy I pursued the reduction to an absurdity plan—demonstrating that, according to its first point, Christ had died in vain: personal chastisement atones for sin, sanctifies the sinner, and sufficiently honors the Divine government. Of course, then, you substitute personal sufferings for Christ's life, death, and resurrection—for the whole work of the Holy Spirit; and in lieu of the whole remedial economy, called the Church of God, or the Kingdom of Heaven, and give transcendant honors to your Purgatory system as saving all its subjects! This, then, stultifies and nullifies the gospel of Christ. Your second point assumes that *God cannot punish sin*—he can only chastise it into holiness! Nothing is due to the law of God, or to his own dignity, or that of his government, after sin is chastised into holiness!! Your third point represents God as punishing those who are holy: for they have all ceased sinning in thought, word, and deed,

the moment they enter your temporal Hell: for if they did not, the debt never could be paid, and they could never get out!! Your fourth point deprives God of the power of forgiving sin, or of showing mercy to sinners. When all pay their own debts, who can forgive them! and therefore none of your Hell-fire converts can ever praise the Lamb of God or join the song of Heaven. They *burned* their robes bright in the flames of Tophet, rather than *washed* them white in the blood of the Lamb. They admire Indignant Justice that punished them into purity and innocence, and sing not the praises of Mercy or sin-forgiving Grace!! The greater the sinner, the greater the saint; the severer the pains of Purgatory, the more the bliss of heaven; the longer the passage through, the more rest at the end!! The sinner suffers for himself, and puts away his own sins by his own sorrows. Your fifth point makes both the punishment and the chastisement of sin absurd: for it is not infinite in its consequences; therefore it would of itself come to an end in every case. Adam would have returned to Paradise, and Abel to life, and Cain to holiness, if let alone; because sin is not endless in its effects or infinite in its consequences!! Your sixth point makes a person righteous and wicked by the same law: Obedience is righteousness—transgression, unrighteousness. The same law in both cases. Now if those who go into your prison guilty and condemned, come out innocent and just by law, is it not demonstrable that the broken law has been mended at the same time the sinner was made just? You give to the sinner, therefore, the power of *mending the law* as well as himself, or of giving to God's law the power of justifying the same person whom it had condemned!—and finally you make the effect not only annihilate its own cause, the creature extinguish its Creator, punishment destroy sin; but you make punishment kill itself. The viper bites itself and dies. The fire goes out because the fuel is all consumed.

26. Room fails to recapitulate the whole discussion. Your system is that of a circle; and your logic follows it. You prove your philology by your theology, and your theology by your philosophy; and then you prove your philosophy sometimes by the others and sometimes by itself. Like the Romanist who proves his church by his Bible, and then his Bible by the church, you prove your divinity by your philosophy, and your philosophy by your divinity. Your grand assumption is that endless punishment is unnecessary. As though your eye pierced through all the infinities of the universe, you affirm that although certain reasons may justify temporal punishments, no reasons can justify eternal punishment.

27. But to conclude, my system is infallibly safe, yours being true. In following peace with all men, and holiness, we shall certainly enjoy God forever. But he that risks any thing on your philosophy is like one that attempts to circumnavigate the earth in a paper boat. It would be strange if what is infallibly safe could not be infallibly true. Our system is then, in my judgment, as well as in yours, infallibly safe; and in this one point we finally and fortunately agree.

28. We choose to love God because he first loved us, rather than to have to love him because he has first tormented us. You hazard an immense responsibility and condemnation, if we are right. For ten thousand worlds I would not take your chance! You are hourly weakening the threatenings and the promises of God, and the motives

to prompt and constant obedience. "Knowing the *terrors of the Lord*" —"that we must all stand before the tribunal of Christ, to receive in our bodies what we have done, good or bad," we persuade men to forsake sin and ruin, on pain of eternal destruction. Now surely if we fail, your plea of endless restorationism will assail them in vain. And if we change the topic, and persuade men by the *love of God* displayed in the gift of his Son, making him a *sin-offering* for us, and fail, you need not talk of a love that forgives no sin till the sinner has suffered for it: so that whether love or wrath, hope or fear, joy or sorrow be the motive, ours is to yours as the universe to an atom—eternity to a moment.

29. See you not the total inefficiency of your doctrine in the grossly licentious and immoral lives of an immense mass of its truest believers? The moral men among you are the result of a better system. The wicked among you are either the effects of your system, or they embraced it as an opiate to their fears. True benevolence, sir, cries out, Danger! and would rather exaggerate than lessen its claims. There is not a spark of real philanthropy in the bosom of a thoroughgoing Universalist. Their philanthropy is spurious. Jesus the great philanthropist warned every sinner of "the worm that never dies," and of "the fire that shall never be quenched." His dogma was *the certainty* of future punishment: "*Unless you repent you shall all perish.*"—Repent, I sincerely beseech you, Mr. Skinner, and believe the true gospel, peradventure the Lord may forgive your many efforts to neutralize both his justice and his grace. Would to God that it be not yet too late!!

Sincerely and benevolently your friend,

A. CAMPBELL.

July 3d, 1839.

P. S. Not having received any proposal for the copy-right, and as your party published the discussion between Dr. Ely and Mr. Thomas in a separate volume, I therefore tender to you the right so far as my interest goes. If you or your friends decline, I presume the right will be conceded to me?

News from the Churches.

GEORGETOWN, Ky., June 26, 1839.

SINCE I last wrote you I held a meeting of a day or two in this neighborhood, and immersed a most amiable young married lady, whose example I hope will influence several others who are capable of doing much good for the cause. Last Saturday, Lord's day and morning, I was at South Elkhorn again. Brother Fleming was with me on Saturday and Lord's day, and may the Lord bless him for his faithfulness and his untiring efforts in the glorious work. We gained fourteen during the meeting, making seventy-one in all at this place, and thirty at Republican. On Monday morning we obtained two young gentlemen who had received their education at our College.

The success in the above-named neighborhood is a most triumphant display of the truth and power of the gospel, as acknowledged by all parties. It speaks almost as much for the advancement of the cause, as the recent reconciliation of the difficulty amongst the brethren at Lexington. Both parties acted nobly. They were willing to forget and forgive, and acted upon the principle of mutual forgiveness and forbearance. As the mutual friend of both parties I approached them, and without the compromise of any truth or principle the matter was amicably adjusted in a very short time, taking as the basis the preamble and resolutions which you had furnished them. May the matter rest forever! The cause has received incalculable benefit from this reconciliation. Bless the Lord, O my soul!

J. T. JOHNSON.

LEXINGTON, Ky., June 26, 1839.

I am sorry you published the last clause of my letter of the 4th of May. Knowing you were acquainted with all the circumstances that led to our difficulties, it was intended for your satisfaction alone. Had I expected it to have been published, I would have worded it differently. I *will* now state, that by the adoption of the *preamble* referred to, both parties made *mutual* concessions, so far as they had acted improperly. Give this a place in the next Harbinger, and oblige yours sincerely.

J. G. CHINN.

The following is the basis of the reconciliation alluded to:—

"WHEREAS we, formerly members of one and the same congregation of Christians, have been alienated, estranged, and separated from one another in consequence of diversities of opinions, misunderstandings, and debates on certain questions of church order and expediency, and to the no small disparagement and scandal of the pure and peaceable religion of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and to the great detriment of the progress of the truth and cause of reformation in our own immediate vicinity; and believing that, as there is confessed and acknowledged amongst us all but one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one Spirit, one hope, as there is but one body of Christ, and one God and Father of all—that all such divisions and schisms are contrary to the constitution of Christ's kingdom and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, and decidedly injurious to the following of that PEACE and holiness without which no man shall see the Lord; and also believing that we have all erred from the ways of truth and peace, either in temper, word, or action, and perhaps in all; and desirous that hereafter all difficulties and strife may cease, and that the unity of the Spirit may be preserved and maintained amongst us, we have, in the spirit of mutual concession and forgiveness, resolved and agreed as follows;—

"*Resolved*, 1*st*. That all those resolutions, acts, and proceedings towards one another, which have either originated the present division, or originated from it since the month of December, 1837, shall be annulled and expunged from our records, and shall henceforth exercise no influence over our mutual intercourse.

"*Resolved*, 2*d*. That all the officers of the church hereafter to be elected, whether appointed by the suffrage of the brethren, or set apart by the imposition of hands, shall be equally regarded as the officers of

the church; and, as such, shall be equally respected and submitted to by the brethren.

"*Resolved*, 3*d*. That in all questions of expediency, such as respects the temporal relations of the church, or in choosing an Evangelist, where a unanimity does not obtain, the minority shall submit to a clearly ascertained majority of the whole church.

"The foregoing is a true copy of the Preamble and Resolutions as they came from the hands of brother Alexander Campbell; and which were, without alteration, adopted by the *minority* on Lord's day morning, April 14th, 1839; and on the 18th of the same month taken up, and the Preamble and 1st and 2d Resolutions adopted by the *majority*, and the following proposed in lieu of the 3d Resolution, viz.—

"*Resolved*, 3*d*. That in all matters of opinion, expediency, &c. such as choosing an Evangelist, or electing officers, &c. after full and fair notice given of the time and place of the meeting of the congregation for such purposes as above, where unanimity does not obtain, a majority of the brethren present shall govern.

"On the 12th May, 1839, the minority proposed to make a change in the 3d Resolution, so as to read as follows, viz.—'That in all questions of expediency, such as respects the temporal relations of the church, or in choosing an Evangelist, where unanimity does not obtain, after full and fair notice given of the time and place of the meeting of the congregation for such purposes as above, a majority of the brethren present shall govern'—"which was accepted by the *majority;* and thus the difficulties ended."

The publication of brother Chinn's letter alluded to was an oversight of which we are not often culpable. The manner in which it has been corrected by brother Chinn, and received by the brethren restored, is alike honorable to both parties. Offences may come, for they did come in the primitive age; but it is a gracious as well as a glorious triumph over Satan, to make them minister to the good of the parties and to the success of the cause. A. C.

LOUISVILLE, Ky., April 4, 1839.

You will remember that when you arrived here from the South, on your way home, about the 4th of March, brethren John T. Johnson and W. Morton were here holding a protracted meeting; and that when you, with brother Morton, left for Shelbyville two days after, brother Johnson remained and continued to speak to large audiences for some ten days. The result was, that about forty-four, old and young, of both sexes, obeyed the gospel. We immersed about ten little girls and boys, from 12 to 14 years old—a most interesting scene truly! We are sorry, indeed, to say, however, that much scepticism exists among parents upon the subject of their children's obeying Christ; some thinking them too young to put on the yoke; others fearing they will not marry well if saved from sin and its sickly parade, and joined to Christ, being adorned with a meek and quiet spirit, far, yea very far superior to that outward adorning necessary for a worldly life.

Permit me to say to our beloved brethren abroad, that we much rejoice, as a congregation, in its present peaceable and orderly condition. For some years past much confusion and disorder has more or less existed, without the government of scriptural officers, and exerting but little moral influence over either those within or without; and even at

present she is without the government of elders from the want of suitable materials; but we thank God that for the last six months past we have been without strife and confusion, the discipline of the church is more strictly attended to, and a gradual improvement is moving on in both manners and knowledge. May the Lord Jesus preserve us from Diotrephes, and all who walk contrary to the teachings of the Holy Twelve.

Our present number is about 175 or 180, and our beloved fellow-laborers have promised to come again speedily to our help. We cordially invite our teaching brethren to visit us. Our meeting-house is on Fifth street, between Chesnut and Walnut.

GEO. W. ELLEY.

BOONE COUNTY, Mo,, 1839.

Without filling your pages with particular details, I would observe, that upwards of 30 have been added during the present season, at the different places I have been, when I was present, and a number of others at several of the same places, when other teaching brethren have been with them. Several congregations in this section have had considerable additions recently—particularly Rocheport, and the Nine Mile Prairie in Callaway county. A few weeks ago brothers M. P. Wills, Lancaster, and myself, took a *small* campaign on the South side of the Missouri river; the excessive rains and unusual high waters, seemed to be much against us. At Georgetown, in Pettis county, we planted a church of eleven members, and left them with an intelligent bishop and deacon. The prospects are very encouraging in that county, if there was only an able teacher there. On last Lord's we had three additions in Columbia, one by confession and two by letter. The two added by letter were old brother Lee and his wife, who are favorably known to the brethren near you in Ohio, Virginia, Pennsylvania. It will no doubt be pleasing to his friends to learn that he has settled near Columbia, and is diligently engaged in exercising his *gift* as a teacher, to the edification and pleasure of his newly made friends.

THOMAS M. ALLEN.

SOLON, Ohio, June 27, 1839.

I attended a meeting on last Lord's day in Munson, which had been appointed by brethren Collins and Dr. Robison. Seventeen were immersed; nine on the same day were immersed in Weled by brother Marse and A. S. Hayden.

Our yearly meeting and meeting of the teaching brethren commence on Friday before the first Lord's day in September next. You will please publish it in the Harbinger. It is confidently expected you will attend with us.

ADAMSON BENTLEY.

MODE OF ENDOWING BACON COLLEGE.

GEORGETOWN, June 27th, 1839.

Brother Campbell,

I DESIRE to suggest a plan for endowing Bacon College, through the Harbinger, which I hope will be promptly acceded to by our brethren and friends.

1. The effort will be to obtain from 1 to 1000 names, of $100 each, payable in five equal annual instalments. 2. The principal to be held sacred. 3. The half of the interest to be faithfully devoted to the education of such poor youths as may be selected by the Trustees. 4, Payment to commence within the year, ending the 1st of July, 1840. The above are the conditions.

As a Trustee, I shall feel it my duty to have the names of the donors inscribed on parchment or marble, and subjected to the inspection of the friends and relatives of the party.

As I wrote you a few days past, at the conclusion of our meeting at Republican, the above proposition was submitted by the Agent, C. J. Smith, sustained by brother T. Smith and myself; and, to the eternal honor of the brethren, ten of them nobly stepped forward and became the first fruits of the plan.

It would be an easy matter for 1000 to engage in this benevolent design. A letter from any one authorizing his signature to the above scheme, would relieve us from much labor. The benefits of such an endowment are incalculable. We should then occupy elevated ground. Surely the wealthy brethren will not need to be entreated to engage in this benevolent enterprize.

If this call is properly responded to, we shall have the names of one thousand persons before the expiration of 1839. I pray the Lord for its success.

Most affectionately yours,

J. T. JOHNSON.

BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

The *Christian Watchman*, as quoted in the *Christian Index*, for July, 1839, has given us a good article on "the baptism of the Holy Ghost." It is now admitted that this was the impartation of miraculous gifts on the Apostles, and that no one since that day has been baptized by the Holy Spirit. The article ends with this grave and pertinent advice:—"We would respectfully and kindly ask them" (who pray for themselves or others to be baptized with the Holy Spirit) "if they had not better omit them," (such prayers,) "as long as there is ground to fear that in using them they are guilty of the presumption of supplicating Jehovah for the miraculous powers of the Apostles." The writer of this article is incorrect in admitting this baptism to be confined to the day of Pentecost. The first Gentile converts in Cornelius' house were also subjects of it. Thus we have lived to see one of our most obnoxious tenets, without note or comment, adopted by two of our most popular journals.

BAPTISM IN FIRE

At the request of some of our *Baptist* readers we promise a dissertation on Matthew iii, some of these days; in which we expect to manifest that they who pray to be "baptized in fire," pray to be sent to destruction. I have no doubt but our views on that subject also will be adopted by the popular journals of at least the Baptist society. I should be glad, however, that there was a little more honesty in giving credit. Surely they have *charged* us with so many errors, they ought to give us *credit* for some services rendered them.

ALL ELDERS BISHOPS.

We have the pleasure to see another of our oft-ridiculed errors consecrated by the late *Synod* of the Evangelic Lutheran Church, held in last June:—

"*Bishops.*—Whereas the claim of superiority of one minister over another, is pretended to be derived from the Bible; whereas this principle has occasioned much mischief, controversy, and denunciation; and whereas, by an impartial, critical, and exegetical investigation of the Bible on this subject, it appears clearly to us, that the appellations of Elder and Bishops are terms interchangeably employed to designate the identical office; and that either of them are scriptural names for the minister of Jesus Christ—Therefore,

"*Resolved*, That the appellation of Bishop seems to us the most appropriate to designate the character and employment of every ordained minister of Jesus Christ; and that this title be henceforth applied to all such persons, indiscriminately."

This is also endorsed by the *Union Herald* of July 13th. A. C.

MR. LYND.

From the Cross and Baptist Journal.

We have just received the following note from Rev. Mr. Lynd:—

"MR. CAMPBELL.

"I stated in the close of my last reply, that I should proceed forthwith to review Mr. Campbell's system of Christianity Restored. Finding, however, that brethren in different States of the Union are impressed with the conviction that sufficient has been said

already; that Campbellism is a heterogeneous mass that has had its run, and must soon fall to pieces if not sustained by opposition; and that there is nothing in its appearance to call for refutation, I have concluded to suspend, for the present, any further consideration of the subject."

Very prudent conclusion! What a pity that my worthy friend had not made this discovery some months ago! So ends the controversy. Why are all the Baptist scribes and preachers averse to having printed in one volume their views and ours on this much disputed point, and circulated through all the country!! The truth is, they have *almost* agreed with us, and dare not commit themselves on the only point of practical importance on which we do in fact differ from them. Be it remembered, then, that I am willing at any time to stereotype a volume of letters, or a discussion with any Baptist Doctor or respectable scribe, on the subject of Spiritual or Divine Influence, of 150 pages or of 200 pages, as an end of the controversy, and then circulate it far and wide throughout the land, *just at cost*.

A. C.

CHRISTIAN PALLADIUM.

"Mr. Campbell.—In No. 3, vol. 3, of the Millennial Harbinger, we find the editor of that work has devoted *six* closely printed pages, o a former controversy between himself and Elder H. Grew of Philadelphia: in preferring ungenerous and unchristian-like charges against the ex-editor of the Palladium, in misrepresenting our sentiments as a people, and in expressing his lamentation that our paper was ever called by its present name. And then requests to have the 'whole of his remarks copied into the Palladium.'

"We are sorry to see Mr. C chafed in his feelings, as he appears to have been when he wrote the article to which we have referred; and to witness the unmanly treatment he has shown to our predecessor, after he had peaceably retired from his laborious duties as editor of the Palladium. We cannot open our columns to Mr. C.'s article, because the censorious spirit which it breathes, is incompatible with the religious character of our paper."

C. Ful.

There is no *censorious* spirit in the above! 'It is incompatible with the *religious character* of our paper'—to publish both sides! Why not allow his readers to judge of my censorious spirit? It is now a clearly ascertained fact that the Christian Palladium is one-sided, and refuses to its readers any hearing of our defence from its calumnies. It misrepresents, abuses, and slanders us to its readers, and then refuses us a hearing. And is this the *Christian* Palladium!! From such Christianity may the good Lord soon deliver his cause and people in this world! We have in the above extract given to our readers the apology of the new Editor for his course towards us; from which they may infer the spirit of the work.

A. C.

IMPOSTORS.

There is much need for such a vigilance and attention to good order and respect to public opinion, as suggested in the following communication from the excellent and greatly beloved brother whose name is so precious among all who know him:—

Georgetown, Ky., June 26th, 1839.

Dear brother Campbell,

The impositions practised upon us by Parker, Vint, and others, should induce us to adhere more rigidly to the instructions of the Apostles in selecting and ordaining Evangelists and other officers of the congregations; and to adopt a system of correspondence which would operate as a safeguard in all such cases. Any person who travels over the country as an Evangelist, without authority from a congregation of the Lord, does not understand the genius, the spirit, and the obligations of the Christian religion; and this being true, such a person ought not to be received. He ought to be better advised and sent home. Every Evangelist should be the selected and ordained officer of some congregation; and it is most prudent to have a prescribed boundary in most cases. The Evangelist should feel it his indispensable duty to have his letters of credit and authority always at command, and he should never approach a strange neighborhood without producing them. As a further guard, he should compel the officers of the congregations where he labors and travels to take a memorandum of his place of residence, with the names of the officers from whom he has received his credentials.

To afford an additional safeguard in such cases, it would be well for the congregations to have the names of their Evangelists published in our periodicals, with their fields of labor.

Whenever a man goes from home to preach amongst strangers, without authority, he ought to be rejected; for it is the best evidence that he lacks some important qualification.

I began to suspect the purity of Parker in a week or so after I wrote the letter you have published I was fearful, however, of doing him injustice, and let the matter rest until I saw his confinement, as a counterfeiter, announced. I prefer to have erred on the safe side. But we should have been more rigid and scrupulous with him. Such a man merits the Penitentiary; and if he should visit these parts again, I presume he will be put to the trial. What black-hearted hypocrisy to approach a congregation as a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, whilst basely meditating cheatery and crime!!

Most affectionately yours,

J. T. JOHNSON.

BRANDYWINE, Shelby county, Ia., July 1st, 1939.

Brother Campbell,

There appears to be a necessity, which we did not anticipate when we advertised Spencer K. Milton, of describing his person. This necessity arises from the fact of his having changed his name in Illinois, and having latterly again changed his name, which last cognomen is forgotten. Said Milton is of ordinary stature, near forty years of age, having scarcely any hair on his head, sandy complexion, low forehead, very prominent on the back part of his head, which presents, together with his baldness, a very singular appearance. He has a harsh voice.

The above description, with others before published, is deemed sufficient to enable the brethren to detect him wherever he may be. We wish the brethren in Iowa, or wherever he may be to give information to brother Campbell where he is, and by what name he is called.

T. J. MATTHEWS.

The very and identical Spencer K. Milton is, as we have recently learned, a disguised Universalist. He is the true and proper author of the communication signed "SPENCER," from which sprang the Universalian controversy. He pretended to be a *Disciple of Christ*, and associated with us, while in heart he was a thorough going Universalist dyed in the wool.

A. C.

THE NEW EDITION OF THE CHRISTIAN BAPTIST.—A NEW PROPOSITION.

I AM constantly asked why the new edition of this work does not make its appearance. The reason is, that there are not enough subscribers to justify the undertaking. I now propose to modify the proposition for this edition, so as more generally to distribute this work. Should I meet with sufficient encouragement, it shall be issued in monthly numbers, of four very large sheets, each number containing nearly as much as four of the *Millennial Harbinger*—the whole work of seven volumes to be thus completed in one year from January 1st, 1840, *at the unusual low price of two dollars in advance, or eleven copies for 20 dollars in advance.* A very large edition will be requisite to justify the enormous expense which will be incurred; and no papers can be sent but to those who pay in advance, or at least upon the receipt of the first number. These proposals are the most liberal that can be made, and place the work, which originally cost 7 dollars, executed in an inferior manner, within the reach of every one, and upon as cheap terms as those popular religious tracts which are sustained by immense donations and combinations of powerful parties These parties do publish their works to the four winds, and annually give thousands for this purpose Are not our views as precious to us, and more so? Then let churches arise, and individuals combine to scatter the Christian Baptist, the pioneer of the glorious reformation which we plead Let every neighborhood take hundreds. It will now be issued in such form that all may be read as it appears, without being wearied with the magnitude of the undertaking. Let the Evangelists and Elders bring the subject before the brethren. The postage will be less than two volumes of the Harbinger.

I have the stereotype plates, which enable me to cheapen the work; but, should it be preferred, I will make these plates emphatically the property of the churches; if they will pay cost, which is far below the present price. Then the work might be published by a committee.

I can furnish specimens of the type, &c. to any who may apply. It is hoped that immediate applications will be made, so that timeous preparations may be made to insure a regular and substantial issue of the work. In the mean time, those who want the bound volumes can have them during the year, at the rates formerly published, viz.—Substantially bound in sheep, $3,00, or four copies for $10,00. No packages sent at my risk, except to my General Agents.

The Christian Baptist comprises about 1800 pages of the original seven volumes, in one large and handsome royal octavo of 670 pages two columns on a page It was the first publication in the current reformation, and the model of all the others. Containing the history and developments of the first seven years, its place can be supplied by no other work; and it will always continue to be the most important book of reference for that period of our religious history. Moreover, it has the advantage of all the subsequent periodicals in the number and variety of its well written and elaborate essays Of these, there are about one hundred from the pen of Mr Campbell, embracing several series on the

most important subjects ever discussed. Many thousands of persons have been converted to God by the gospel contended for in the Christian Baptist since it ceased being published, who are not furnished with the work. To these the essays on the Restoration of the Ancient Order of Things, will be worth the price of the whole book; and it may be added, all who wish to possess themselves of the most valuable documents in the Reformation, will do well to secure a copy of this cheap and valuable edition.

I can be addressed directly, post paid, or through my general agents, A. Campbell, P. M., Bethany, Va.; and C. U. M'Hatton, P. M., Georgetown, Ky. D. S. BURNET.

OBITUARY NOTICES.

TRIUMPHANTLY departed this life, on the — May, sister DUVAL, wife of *B. F. Duval*, of Versailles, Ky. She was long and ardently devoted to the cause of Reformation, and in the last moments of her life very emphatically declared her confidence in the excellence of those principles, and the joy which they afforded in the immediate prospect of death.

Fell asleep in Christ on the 17th of June, sister SUSAN KING, daughter of *Judge King*, Warren, Ohio. Blest with one of the most exemplary of Christian mothers, she was herself one of the happiest illustrations of the powerful influence of maternal piety in forming Christian character. Early in life she manifested a desire to profess the faith of Christ and unite with the Presbyterian church, of which her mother was then a member. But a firm belief in the Saviour of sinners, an ardent love for his character, and a fervent desire to keep his commandments, were not enough to procure admission into that church. About the age of 16 she visited her Episcopalian relatives in the city of Hartford. Finding that they required but the profession of the faith and hope in Christ for admission, she united with them. But on her return to Warren, and after a more enlarged view of the Christian Scriptures, she disapproved of her Episcopalian baptism, and was immersed into the body of Christ. Thence to the moment of her death, her life was an ornament to her sex and her profession. Surrounded with abundant means of worldly gratification, she was a pattern of self-denial; and, in the midst of every variety of reading, her Bible was almost exclusively the book of her study, "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord."—[*Communicated by* M. C.]

At Wellsburg, Va., on the morning of the 9th July, after a lingering illness, borne with unmurmuring patience and resignation, gently expired, in the blest hope of the resurrection of the just, ELIZA ANN CAMPBELL, wife of *John C. Campbell*, Esq., and second daughter of *Alexander Campbell*, of Bethany. Naturally sprightly, cheerful, and fond of life, with almost every thing to make it desirable, few persons at the early age of 25, as we judge, have, with more calmness, self-possession, and acquiescence, "left the warm precincts of the cheerful day," and resigned their spirit into the hands of the Redeemer, or bowed with more submission to his will.

At the early age of 14 she confessed the Lord, and was buried with him in baptism; and during her last illness often said, that all that could render longer life desirable to her, did the Lord will it, next to the happiness of her relatives, would be the opportunity of exhibiting the excellency of Christ in a life of active and enlarged benevolence. Plans of usefulness to the souls of men, after she should have entered into rest, were amongst the last thoughts and arrangements of her life. An assurance that to her "to die was gain," forbids us to grieve as those that have no hope, and reconciles us to an affliction otherwise grievous beyond expression.

We return our unfeigned thanks to many brethren and friends for their condolence, and to none more gratefully than to the beloved and highly esteemed writer of the following lines:—

"CINCINNATI, July 13, 1839.

"*Very dear Brother*,

"Permit me, having more than once enjoyed the happiness and shared in the delights of your family circle, to mingle with you the tear of sorrow, and share with you in that unsatisfying grief occasioned by the separating hand of an all-wise Providence. Brother Tenes has just called and told me that your excellent daughter Eliza is no more! Could tears of bitter grief but bring her back, (were that desirable,) or heal the wounded spirits her departure has made, how freely would I pour them forth! The fairest flower, the purest heart, the clearest intellect, must all fall before the scythe of Time; and a few more strokes of this untiring reaper may gather us to those *who are not here*, BUT GONE BEFORE! But she knew that her Redeemer lives, and no doubt drew such consolation and courage from this truth, as strengthened her in the passage of the dark valley of the shadow of death. I would that I could have seen her once more before she left us, and followed, with her numerous friends, her body to the grave; but that sad pleasure was not to others: and as she cannot return to us, may the Lord our God enable us to go to her.

"EDWD. B. HOWELLS."

CORRESPONDENTS.

Communication from H. Grew in our next. The conclusion of the Universalist controversy has displaced our essay on Education, and other communications, of which we have an unusual number on hand.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER,

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME III.——NUMBER IX.

BETHANY, VA. *SEPTEMBER*, 1839.

BAPTISM IN FIRE.

"I indeed immerse you in water in order to your reformation: but he that comes after me is mightier than I: *he will immerse you in the Holy Spirit, and in fire.*"
John the Baptist.

"*In the Holy Spirit and in fire*," say some of our Rabbis, means simply *in the Holy Spirit*. Of this opinion are Adam Clark, Matthew Henry, Dr. Samuel Clark, with many others. Others, not thinking this natural, inasmuch as fire is not the sacred emblem of spiritual blessings, have sought to exclude the phrase "and in fire" out of the sacred text as an interpolation, on the ground that it is wanting in several manuscripts. But as it is found again in Luke iii., 16. in all the manuscripts, they are as much as ever pressed with the difficulty.

When asked how can the influence of the Holy Spirit be set forth under *emblems* so opposite as *fire*, and *water*, some of our Doctors allege that as fire purifies certain substances, and water others, both terms may be used as indicative of purification; and in proof of this, they urge that Christians are said to be tried and purified by fire—and that Jesus Christ himself is set forth under the similitude of "the refiner's fire" and "the fuller's soap," by Malachi the last of the Jewish Prophets.

But those of a more discriminating eye allege that the purification of Christians by fire alludes not at all to the influence of the Spirit, but to the influence of persecution. For example—"Think it not strange," says Peter, "concerning the fiery trial which is to try you"—"That the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold, though it be tried by fire, might be found unto praise, and honor, and glory at the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ." "The fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is," says Paul. "The hay, stubble, wood, shall be burned—the gold, silver, precious stones, will stand the fire," &c. &c.

The prophecy in Malachi which exhibits the Messiah as a "refiner's fire and the fuller's soap," is still more unfortunately advanced in proof that *fire* and *spirit* are two names for the same influence. Our most learned expositors, who are most conversant with the imagery of the Old Testament, do not hesitate to expound Malachi in these words: "He," the Lord, "shall consume the wicked by his judgments, and purify those that are sincere by his doctrine;" and this indeed is free enough: for the *refiner's fire* is for consuming the dross, and the *fuller's soap* for separating the filth. But who are the *dross* and the *filth* in that context? Not the sins of men, but the sinners amongst God's people. It is thus explained by the Prophet: "I will come near to you *in judgment*, and I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers, the adulterers, the false swearers, the oppressors, and those that fear not me, saith the Lord of hosts." These are the *dross*—these the *filth* that the Messiah would consume; of which, more particularly in its proper place: for, indeed, our Lord is "a consuming fire." "I am come," says he, "to send fire on the earth, and what will I if it be already kindled?" "I have first," continues he, "to be baptized, and *how am I straitened* till it be accomplished:" then will I send the fire: for "suppose you that I am come to give peace to the earth? I tell you nay; but rather division." As the canons of criticism will not allow us to apply to the *Spirit* what is said of the *Messiah*, so neither will the sacred usage allow us to make the established symbol of punishment the emblem of holiness and peace.

If, then, to be "baptized in fire" mean to be "baptized in the Holy Spirit," it is not merely a pleonasm, but a solecism—an anomaly in the Bible. 'But hold,' says a late expositor, 'does not this *baptism in fire* refer to the day of Pentecost: and was there not an immersion in fire on that day as well as in the spirit?' No fire appeared on that occasion: but on the Apostles appeared the figure of tongues, clear and bright *as* fire; not fiery tongues, but tongues *as of fire*, or of a fiery brilliancy, sat upon each of them. The beauty of this fine figure is undiscovered by those who imagine that the baptism of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost is the baptism in fire. *Tongues as of fire* is quite another thing than they imagine. These holy men, now filled with the Holy Spirit, were now to utter "*the word of the Lord.*" The word of the Lord was now to go forth from Jerusalem. It was to be spoken by human tongues and in all languages; and as that word of the Lord is compared to *fire* in the Prophets, what more apposite in the fitness of imagery, than that tongues resembling fire should sit upon the heads of those who were now to utter the last message of Jehovah to the Jewish nation. "My word," said Jehovah, "is as fire, and as a ham-

mer that breaketh the rock in pieces;" and "my word in thy mouth shall be as fire, and this people wood, and it shall devour them."

Fire, indeed, is in no place the symbol of spiritual blessings. The fire of persecution may be a blessing—afflictions may be a blessing—calamities may be blessings in disguise; but that *fire upon a person* can be a natural blessing, must first be proved before it can be the type or emblem of a spiritual blessing! Will any lover of mysticism undertake to show how fire upon a man's flesh can be refreshing as the water; as preparatory to his proof that to be immersed in flame is an appropriate symbol of the refreshing and consoling influences of the Spirit!

But still more preposterous is this visionary interpretation, when we consider that our Lord, to whom the Baptist refers in this passage, often promised a fiery immersion to his enemies, and never to his friends. In the parable of the Tares, he promises a baptism in fire to his enemies. Matth. xiii. 40—42. "As, therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire, so shall it be in the end of the world: the Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them that do iniquity; and they shall cast them into a furnace (a baptistry) of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth." Again, says he three times, Mark ix., "Better for you to enter into life maimed," &c. "than to go into hell, into the fire that shall never be quenched. And in Matth. xxv., "Depart, you cursed, into the everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels," &c. There is, then, no countenance for such a shocking confusion of figures in any portion of scripture, Old Testament or New. Let us, then, look into the whole context of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John in reference to this point.

Matthew makes the Baptist ask "the vipers" of that day, "many of the Scribes and Pharisees who came to his baptism," to tell "who had prompted them to flee from the wrath to come"—"the impending vengeance" spoken of by Malachi. "For," says that Prophet, speaking of the last days of Jerusalem, and his people, "Behold the day comes, saith the Lord, that shall *burn as an oven*, and all the proud, and all that do wickedly, shall be as *stubble*; and the day that cometh shall *burn them up*, and it shall leave them neither root nor branch." "Behold I will send you Elijah the Prophet before the coming of that *great and terrible day of the Lord*"—the day of this immersion in flame. Here, then, was Elijah in the person of John, saying to those "vipers" who would not reform, "Who has prompted you to flee from the wrath coming on this nation?" "I, indeed," says he, "baptize you, (i. e. men,) *into reformation*," in order to your escaping this vengeance: for "now the axe is ready to cut down all you rotten trees, that you may

be *cast into the fire.*" "He that cometh after me is mightier than I; he shall immerse you (i. e. men,) in the Holy Spirit and in fire." He can separate the pretender from the reformer—"his fan or winnowing shovel is in his hand." "He will indeed cleanse his floor." He will blow out *of you* the chaff, and he will gather out *of you* the wheat into his garner. "He is mightier than I." "He will burn up the chaff in the unquenchable fire." Methinks this is so obvious, that were it not for the word *you*—(he shall baptize *you*)—all men, women, and children might see that it is the meaning of the passage.

That "*you*" means only some of the applicants for John's immersion, is so evident that all men of perception, whatever be their theory of the passage, allow it. Even Mr. Henry himself says, "*You* here means *some of you.*" It is not peculiar to John, nor to any preacher, thus to address men. It is common to all. "I baptize you"—not all the Pharisees and Sadducees—but *some of you.* I baptize men in order to reformation. He will baptize men—some of you in the Holy Spirit, and some of you in fire. But why argue that "*you*" here means only *some of you*, since those who oppose our interpretation agree with us in this point. No man will say that he that followed John would baptize all men who came to his baptism with the Holy Spirit and with fire.

That we justly interpret this passage, is proved from Mark's version of it. He does not mention *the vipers*—he does not allude to those pretenders; and therefore he says *nothing about fire. He speaks only of the immersion in the Holy Spirit.* He speaks of multitudes who "were immersed in the Jordan, *confessing their sins;*" and only adds. "I indeed *have baptized you in water;* but he *shall baptize* you in the Holy Spirit." Now had Mark added "*in fire,*" without the vipers in his premises, our opposers might have had some pretext for their assumption: but as he has omitted both *the generation of vipers* and *the baptism in fire*, they are without excuse for their error.

Again, and still more confirmatory of our views, Luke tells of the multitude and of the generation of vipers that flocked to John's baptism; and he makes John caution them of their temerity and folly, in the same words—assuring them that every tree that yieldeth not good fruit shall be converted into fuel—"he shall immerse you in the Holy Spirit and in fire." The fruit-bearing trees in the Holy Spirit, and the bad fruit, or no-fruit-bearing-trees, "he will burn up in unquenchable fire."

And farther in corroboration we might also cite John, who, like Mark, says nothing of the vipers, and consequently nothing of the baptism in fire; but simply contrasts the baptism in water with the baptism *of* the Spirit. He makes the Baptist say, "I am come baptizing in

water; but he that sent me to baptize *in* water, said, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining, he it is that immerses in the Holy Spirit."

Having shown the remarkable consistency of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John with our interpretation of the passage, if I thought farther illustration or confirmation was needed, I would close with the comment of the Messiah himself. It was spoken after his resurrection and immediately before his ascension. Acts i. 5. John, indeed, said he to his beloved disciples—not to the hypocrites that oft attended John's ministry—but to his disciples, "John truly baptized in water, but you shall (as truly) be baptized in the Holy Spirit not many days hence." No *fire* mentioned here, because none but disciples were addressed. It may not be amiss to add, that Peter himself, when sent to preach the word to the Gentiles—and while speaking it to Cornelius and his friends—on seeing the Holy Spirit descend upon the Gentiles, also says, on rehearsing this strange incident to his brethren, "Then I remembered the word of the Lord, how that he said, John, indeed, immersed in water, but you shall be immersed in the Holy Spirit." No *fire* here, because no enemies, pretending friendship, on the ground.*

May I not say that we have all the testimony and all the evidence that we are correct; and that they err, in their interpretations of this passage, who regard the "baptism in fire" as a spiritual blessing—a heavenly influence upon the soul; or as a pleonastic affirmation of the baptism of the Spirit—equal to saying, He will baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in the Holy Spirit!!

Some of our too ungrateful and ungracious opponents have lately given dissertations on Matth. iii. 11., for the sake of imposing their views of John iii. 5. upon the community. They will have Jesus to say to Nicodemus, 'Unless a man be born of the Spirit and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' Thus they make *water* and *fire* emblems of the same Spirit upon the same persons—indicative of the same change. They are only perplexed a little that Jesus should have placed the *water* before, and John the *fire* after the Spirit. This, indeed, is easily explained—by assuming that there is a degree of carelessnes apparent in the language of our Saviour on other occasions, and we may as well admit it here!!

The threatening was fulfilled; the unbelieving and impenitent Jews, addressed by John, *the generation of vipers*, not long afterwards, were, together with their city and temple, converted into

* Examine an article on this subject in the Millennial Harbinger, first series, vol. ii, page 56. A. D. 1831.

fuel, and immersed in fire, according to the words of Malachi and John. While those who repented at the preaching of John, and were immersed in water confessing their sins, and brought forth the good fruit of a thorough reformation, were immersed into the Spirit and made partakers of his wonderful gifts and powers.

To convert a *threatening* of impending vengeance upon a "generation of vipers" into the promised miraculous influence of the Spirit of God, is no trifling blunder on the part of system-makers. John's address was full of threats to these hypocrites. They are compared to chaff, to dry and rotten trees; and an unquenchable fire is kindling for their destruction. The power, the mighty power of Jesus, is extolled for the purpose of giving force to these threatenings. His power to save and to destroy—to extend the blessings of Heaven to his friends, or the terrors of the lake of fire to his enemies, is clearly set forth; and in defiance both of the scope of the passage and of the established meaning of images, and of all the canons of criticism, some of the abettors of human traditions convert the "baptism in fire" into a blessing, and make a "generation of vipers" participants in the divine influences set forth in this figure! If the Rabbis so teach, what wonder is it if we should hear the unthinking multitude praying to be immersed in fire, or utterly consumed, without knowing what they say!* A. C.

SCEPTICISM.

LETTERS TO B——, A SCEPTIC—*No. VII.*

ALLEGHENNY CITY, July 9th, 1839.

My dear Friend,

I HAVE now fairly, I think, disposed of all the difficulties set forth in your letter. I trust that I have done this to your own satisfaction. You, however, intimate that you have other objections still to propose. I have been waiting for some time for them. In the meantime, having a little leisure, I shall turn my hand against your *citadel;* or, in military phrase, "carry the war into Carthage."

I do not like to be always engaged in "self-defence." You know that it is the opinion of military men, that soldiers are more valiant in in a war of *conquest*, than in one of simple resistance. Pardon this language. *We* are not at *war*. You are an "unwilling *unbeliever*," searching for truth: I, a firm *believer*, laboring to assist you in your researches. It is impressed on my mind that your escape from the gloomy vale of scepticism may be greatly facilitated by an exposure of

* At this moment I have turned over a few pages of some of the senior Rabbis; and, to their credit it ought to be stated, that some of them explain this passage of the fire of hell, as Basil, Theophilus, Keuchenius, Heylin, and others, of the destruction of Jerusalem; while Ambrose, Origen, Hilary, Lactantius, &c. make a sort of *post mortem* purgatory of it.

the "nakedness of the land" where you dwell. Far be it from me to attempt this for the sake of a triumph; but in all benevolence I do it for your conviction and salvation. I will place the matter before you in one short, but compound sentence, thus: All the *virtue* in the world is of *right* to be placed to the account of *revelation*, and all the *vice* in the world is to be placed to the account of *unbelief*. In other words, all the virtues possessed by unbelievers are borrowed (or plundered) from Christianity, and all the vices and defects of professing Christians are "because of their unbelief"! If I prove the former position in a way satisfactory to yourself, you will allow me to prove the latter by the Bible. I am aware that this statement of things may at first sight look a little like persecution—because, if the virtues possessed by unbelievers do not *really* and of *right* belong to them, they have nevertheless *possessed* them *so long*, that the original *fraud* appears to have been lost sight of in the distance by both parties. On the principle of "long established usages," of "vested rights," the British Parliament contended for the *justice* of American taxation, and the *right* of fattening upon the toils of the colonial peasantry. Upon the same principle, the Arab, who had possessed a stolen horse for seven years, pertinaciously claimed him as his own property when the lawful owner came upon him. But be not terrified at this proposed examination, like the dishonest merchant whose ship is to be searched for contraband goods; for should I find such in your possession, I have no intention either to take them from you or to imprison you for the trespass. Far from it. I even feel a *keen regret* that *so few* of the precious gems of gospel grace have been taken, even though it were feloniously, to adorn the persons and characters of the *unbelieving train*. All I wish in this affair is, that, upon due conviction, you should confess that this or that pearl, or gem, or grace, or virtue was *borrowed*, or *stolen*, (pardon the expression,) as the case may be, from the Christian kingdom.

Permit me here to introduce the language of the late eminent Judge Sir Allan Park: "We live in the midst of blessings till we are utterly insensible of their greatness, and of the source from which they flow. We speak of our civilization, our arts, our freedom, our laws, and forget entirely how large a share of all is due to Christianity. Blot Christianity out of the page of man's history, and what would his laws have been?—What his civilization? Christianity is mixed up with our very being, and our daily life: there is not a familiar object around us which does not wear a mask; not a being or a thing which does not wear a different aspect, because the light of Christian hope is on it; not a law which does not owe its truth and gentleness to Christianity; not a custom which cannot be traced in all its holy and healthful parts to the gospel."

To this you may reply—'This is all assertion, although from high judicial authority.' The proof shall be adduced in due time. In the meantime I pray you to consider the fact, that sceptics are reared up in the midst of Christian society; *many*, *very many* of them have pious Christian mothers. The influence of these Christian mothers, when it cannot save from unbelief, often saves from dissipation, and impresses indelibly upon the mind an abhorrence for the grosser vices, and a love for many of the virtues of our holy religion: But it often saves from unbelief. John Randolph said toward the close of his life, "I should

long ago have been an *Atheist*, had not my mother taught me in my childhood to say, Our *Father* who art in heaven." Yes, maternal influence has a magic power to bind the waywardness of youth. And if we speak of republican institutions, they are borrowed from Christianity. Jefferson himself confessed that his views of a republic were taken from a Baptist church. The republican tendencies of the Bible were clearly set forth in a series of lectures by Dr. Beecher, of Cincinnati, about a year since. I noticed shortly after their publication, some strictures in the Cleveland Liberalist upon them; in which the editor of that paper attempts, with an air of confidence, to deride the idea that the Bible had any thing to do with our republican government; and quoted E. Hicks, a Quaker, to prove that we owed our freedom to infidelity alone!! The editor of the Liberalist must calculate largely on the *ignorance*, and credulity too of his readers, and doubtless he has good and sufficient reasons for so doing. *But I challenge him for the proof.*

But to return to *social* and private virtue: It would be strange, indeed, if we must take specimens of infidel character in this Christian land as a fair illustration of the tendencies of infidelity!! No, indeed!! We must look to the place where *Christian mothers have not moulded the infant mind.* Even the editor of the Liberalist himself states that he had pious Christian parents. How much of virtue he has been able to save from the wreck of his patrimonial estate, is a matter shrouded in *great obscurity.* Mr. Owen, too, was reared in the bosom of Christian society. David Hume also had a pious mother, until he himself seduced her from the "path of life." I ask you, then, to go to other *lands* and to other *times.* I will not, however, insist upon your going to the benighted Pagan lands of our own time, or of former times, in search of the gems of virtue. I will allow you to go to the most refined nations that have ever existed, where the light of revelation has not shined, and thence to select the best specimens of human nature. But I have filled my sheet: so farewell for a little.

M. S. CLAPP.

SHORT SERMONS ON CHRISTIAN PRACTICE—*No. V.*

ON BIBLE-READING—*No. II.*

[The following communication from Father Campbell comes so opportunely on the subject of my last sermon on Bible-reading, that I substitute it for mine this month. He is now on a tour in Pennsylvania, and had not seen my first when he wrote this.] A. C.

ON PERSONAL AND FAMILY DEVOTION.

They that are after the flesh, do mind the things of the flesh; they that are after the Spirit, the things of the Spirit. Romans viii, 5. But as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord. Josh. xxiv. 15.

It is truly distressing, to the pious mind, to contemplate the manifest carnality of Christian society—so called. We can hear and see every thing attended to but Christianity. If, therefore, out of the

abundance of the heart we speak and act, our stock of heart religion—of spiritual sentiment and devout affection, must, indeed, be very small. We can scarcely hear a word of it in any family. I speak of professors in general. It is true, we may sometimes hear sectarian controversies, and what is called the religious news of the day—a sort of religious politics. But what Christianity is in these things? What spiritual edification? The four grand cardinal points, which concentrate the entire intentional effect of Christianity, are personal holiness, family education, church edification, and public reformation;—the latter the combined extrinsic effect of the former three. Matth. v. 16. Whatever, then, does not directly and properly tend to promote these, is foreign to the benevolent and blissful design of our holy religion. Now certainly nothing can have a direct and proper tendency to promote personal holiness, which is but another name for supreme love to God, but what goes to promote the knowledge, belief, and retention of the holy scriptures. And what means, in our power, are calculated to do this, but reading, thinking, and conversing about their divine contents, (as directed, for this very purpose,) accompanied with prayer to God? And, as personal holiness is essential and fundamental to the three following comprehensive and blissful effects of our holy religion, *that* being duly secured, all is secured, that is nesessary to our present saving utility, and also to our future happiness: "For without holiness no man shall see the Lord." Consequently, every one possessing this, shall enjoy his presence. These things being demonstrably so, how disgusting and mortifying to hear and see, in professing families, almost nothing but the concerns of this world!!—the paltry affairs of a present life!!! They have not time to make an educational and edifying use of the scriptures in their families, by reading them connectively and attentively, with suitable interrogations, observations, and exhortations, for the edification of all concerned, according to their respective abilities; but, if read at all, they close the book without a single remark; and leave it as ignorant and unaffected as before they opened it; and so pass on to something else. Besides they never think of reading it regularly, in its proper connexion, as they do other books they want to understand; or, of assisting one another by conversing with each other familiarly and interestingly about it. Many of these indevout triflers are not ashamed to tell you, that they have not time: that they cannot afford to make such a sacrifice of their precious hours;—thus to waste their time in reading, and praying, and conversing about the sacred contents of the Book of Life. Are not such professors confessedly carnalists;—minders "of the things of the flesh,—earthly things?" Surely;—"For they that are after the Spirit do mind the things of the Spirit." But the things of the Spirit are all Bible things. They are no where else to be found but in the Good Book:—no, not one of them. In so far, then, as we neglect the Bible, we despise and neglect spiritual and heavenly things. But not so the good and happy man—the blessed man,—"for his delight is in the law of the Lord; and in his law doth he meditate day and night." Wherefore, "whatsoever he doeth shall prosper:" but "the ungodly are not so." Psalm i. 1—4. Yea, says another good man, "I have esteemed the words of his mouth more than my necessary food." Job xxiii. 12. And another—"Thy words were found, and I did eat them; and thy word was to me the joy and rejoicing of my heart." No wonder, then, that the godly

Daniel and David, and other such lovers of the divine word, should be as careful to enjoy it, as they were to enjoy their necessary food, even three times a-day, in their family worship: see Psalm lv. 17., with Dan. vi. 10. Nay, the latter did it at the risk of his life. And all these were but Old Testament saints, whose scriptures were as far inferior to ours, as moon-light is to sun-shine; yet they were to make them their constant theme: "they were to talk of them when they sat in their house, when they walked by the way, when they lay down, and when they rose up—teaching them diligently to their children,—that their days might be as the days of heaven upon earth: see Deut. xi. 18—21. Alas! then, of what a heaven upon earth do we deprive ourselves and our children, by neglecting, as we do, our vastly superior privileges! And we have not time to take our three spiritual meals per day, as Joshua, and those other Old Testament worthies did, who, like him, were determined, that, let others do what they pleased, as for them, and their families, they would serve the Lord. And why not, brethren? Can we possibly make a better choice? Can we possibly spend our time to better purpose? Certainly not. But some will, perhaps, say, 'We feel at a loss how to proceed, for we have never seen such a practice.' This excuse, though not sufficient, it must be confessed is lamentably true. Still, however, we have the Book, and in it the proper directions for using it. We are to read it, to study it, to get it by heart, to make it the subject matter of our conversation, of our exhortation, of our meditation, of our prayer, and of our praise, day and night. Thus are we directed to use it. Now what remains, but that we use it accordingly, every one according to his peculiar circumstances, as he does his daily food; some at one hour, some at another; yet all generally three times a-day: those that have families, also thus providing for the nourishment of their families; thus training them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord: that so they may be seminaries of God—nurseries for heaven. And this, it is humbly suggested, may, for the most part, be conveniently and happily effected in the following manner:—

As the demands of our sensitive nature generally bring us together thrice a-day for bodily refreshment, let us avail ourselves of those opportunities for our spiritual refreshment also. For this purpose let every Christian family keep two tables; the one furnished with Bibles for feeding their souls, as the other is with the products of the earth for their bodily food. Thus provided, when they meet for breakfast, let them first take their spiritual meal, thus socially beginning the day with God—by reading a certain select portion of his word, with suitable questions, remarks, and exhortations for this purpose; thus rightly dividing the word of truth, that each may get his proper portion. This may be conveniently done by asking the following pertinent questions according to the respective capacities of the guests, viz.—1. Who is the writer or speaker of the portion read, or of any particular part of it? 2. To whom is it written or spoken? 3. What historic facts are contained in it? 4. What commands are contained in it? 5. What doctrinal declarations? 6. What invitations? 7. What promises? 8. What threatenings? Lastly, the why, when, and where those things were spoken or written, still remain to be considered, and are circumstances sometimes worthy of particular attention, in order to a correct understanding of particular passages. These things duly

attended to according to the ability and discretion of the heads of families, and the capacity of the respective members, with pertinent observations and exhortations, accompanied with appropriate prayers and praises, could not fail to make the scriptures forthcoming for the edification and instruction of every capable subject. These blissful exercises repeated thrice a-day, viz.—before breakfast, after dinner, and after supper, we would begin, continue, and end the day with God, as a family; that is, in our social capacity. And these exercises continued, the word of Christ would dwell in us richly, so that we should be neither barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ, and thus we should never fall. "For so an entrance should be ministered to us abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." 1 Peter i. 5—11. For this is the highway of personal holiness—from which all good and happiness proceed. And which, of course, being carried out into the church, by its duly qualified Elders, those heads of families who had thus successfully taught and ruled their own families well, the church would shortly resume its proper character, the school of Christ, with his one Book, Christian disciples, a family of families, taught and ruled by a selection of its own proper elders, instead of scientific college-taught clergy; every member furnished with his own proper book—the Book of life; which, being duly read and studied as above, would make every believing student "wise to salvation, thoroughly furnished for all good words." May the good Lord hasten that happy time! Amen.

THOMAS CAMPBELL.

CHRISTIANS AMONG THE SECTS—*No, VI.*

POSITIVE ORDINANCES.

CHRISTIANOS has at last, by a very circuitous route, approached the desired object. He feels very thankful to his brethren for the quiet he has been permitted to enjoy for a long time. Aware that some alarm has been created in the minds of a few of the brethren, lest the tendency of these essays should be to conciliate the brethren of other denominations at the expense of truth, or to detract from the value and dignity of positive ordinances, I hasten to relieve them from these apprehensions with all convenient speed.

But, in the meantime, I wish to steer my little *bark*, so as to avoid both the rocks and the whirlpool. Far be it from me to wish to conciliate any class of men by crying, "Peace! peace! when there is no peace." I will not, knowingly, "call evil *good*, and good *evil*," nor "put darkness for light, and light for darkness." Far be it from me to teach men to violate "one of the least" of the statutes of the heavenly King. I would not *wish* to be the "least in the kingdom of heaven."

I trust that my great object has been sufficiently manifest, viz.—to prove that all *true religion* has its seat in the *heart*, and that no positive ordinance is of any account, *only* as it affects the *state of the heart*. I have no intention, however, of flattering my brethren of other denominations with the idea that *they* have among them a great deal of "heart

religion," or spirituality; and that my own brethren are *all* trusting in outward forms. So far from this, that, so far as the human eye can discover, the *great mass of all denominations* are wholly devoid of spirituality—they are trusting entirely to external observances! Apart from a weekly attendance on public worship, they could not be distinguished from the vain ones of the world. So gay, so trifling, so vain are they in behaviour, in conversation, in dress; so eager are they in the pursuit of wealth; so entirely engrossed are they in every object of worldly pursuit. But let not my brethren think that *they* are in any wise clear in these great matters! No, indeed!! They are involved in one common censure. I rejoice exceedingly that there are *honorable exceptions* to these general—these fearful truths. There are some of my own brethren who conduct as "citizens of heaven," who "walk as chilldren of the light and of the day," who "worship God in spirit, and have no confidence in the flesh:" I rejoice also that there are among *all* the different denominations those who "deny themselves to ungodliness and worldly lusts, and live soberly, and righteously, and godly in a present world;" who offer unto God "the sacrifice of a broken heart;" who are of "an humble and contrite spirit, and who tremble at the word of the Lord;" who "fear God and work righteousness;" consequently, "are accepted of him." I entreat my beloved brethren that they be not deceived!! It will never be asked of us in the *great day* whether or not we were "baptized for the remission of our sins;" nor will any thing at all be inquired concerning our *views*, or the state of our *heads;* but the inquiry will be concerning our practices, and the state of our hearts!! Have our hearts been indurated with *selfishness*, and *callous* to the woes of suffering humanity? Have we shut our ears against the "cry of the poor and needy"? Have we closed our eyes against scenes of affliction and distress, lest our hearts should be moved by them? Have we "betrayed him that wandereth," or refused to "cover the naked with a garment"? Have we remained in selfish ease and indifference, while the disciples of Jesus were "sick or in prison"? Then, indeed, will the irrevocable doom be passed upon us, "Depart, you cursed, into the everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels." But if, on the other hand, we have made a common cause with Jesus our Saviour, in the wants and woes of suffering humanity—

> "If from the bower of ease we've fled
> To soothe affliction's lowly bed."

if, like Job, we have been "eyes to the blind, and feet to the lame;" if, like him, we have been "fathers to the poor," and cases of woe and distress we "knew not" have "searched out;" if we have "visited the widow and the orphan in their affliction, and kept ourselves unspotted from the world;" if we have cheered the gloom of the prison-house with our ministering presence and consoling voice; if we have sought to soothe the aching head and wounded spirit of the sick and the sorrowful; if we have done all these things from a *pure heart*—from love to Jesus our Lord; then forever blessed and happy shall we be! Yes, the Judge of the universe will say to us, in the presence of assembled worlds, "Come, you blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." "Eternal renown" awaits us! "Glory, honor, and peace, to every man

that worketh good." "To them who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, honor, and immortality," to them will he render "eternal life." The immutable principles by which the general judgment will be conducted are set forth in the 25th chapter of the testimony of Matthew.

But here an objection may arise in the minds of some of my brethren—Does not the Apostle say, "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments"? Will not all who are truly *pure in heart*—all who thus love the Saviour—will they not come and unite with us, embrace the "ancient gospel," and be "baptized for the remission of sins"? To this I reply—It was never the intention of our Lord to convert the world by a *theory!* He never rested the *success* of his cause on its *intrinsic excellence*, or the immaculate purity and sublimity of his doctrines!! No, he relied on the *practical exemplification* of his doctrine in the *lives* of his people, for the success of his cause. It was the *unity*, the *love*, the *purity*, the *untiring zeal*, the *active benevolence* of his disciples to which he looked for the success of the gospel. Hence our Lord prays that "they all may be one, that the *world* may know that thou didst send me." Again he says, "By this shall *all men know* that you are my disciples, if you have *love* one for another:" "Let your light so shine before *men*, that others seeing your *good works*, may glorify your Father in heaven." I could fill up a long essay with quotations to the same point, but forbear.

These things being so, my brethren therefore greatly *err* in supposing that because we present the ancient truth and simplicity of the gospel in *theory*, that "all the honest and true-hearted *must*, of course, *at once* receive it!" No, my brethren, we must give to the world a *practical exhibition* of primitive Christianity, before we have any *right* to expect that great numbers from other denominations will join us. There is a principle in our nature, which I have no doubt was divinely implanted there, that is *averse* to receive *truth* from those who are trampling it under foot in *practice*, while recommending it in *theory!* While others can with truth and propriety turn and say to us, "Physician, heal thyself," all our boasted excellence of *knowledge* will be regarded with the same contempt as were the pretensions of the fabled frog of olden time, who, with all conceivable deformity, proclaimed himself the greatest physician in the world, in possession of all the transforming secrets of the healing art! Brethren, we must reform and reform, and become in *practice* what we are in *theory*, before we have any *right* to expect brethren of other denominations to join us. We must cultivate personal holiness, and family religion. How sadly are we defective in this last item! I have more than *once* lodged with families of professed disciples, (my heart sickens while I write it,) not *private* members, but *bishops* of churches, who neither prayed in their families themselves, nor did they invite any one else to pray or to read the scriptures! Now I declare, in the fear of the Lord, that, were I a member of a church of pious, humble, praying, Bible-reading Scotch Covenanters, I would not leave them to unite with *such a people*, if their *views* were as *pure*, and their *theory* as *sublime*, as the angels of light possess!

But these men can declaim most eloquently against the "errors of the sects," and you would think they had a most pure zeal for the

honor of "the Lord of hosts." We are greatly reminded of an ancient man: "And Jehu said, Come with me, and see my *zeal* for the Lord." "But Jehu took *no heed* to walk in the law of the Lord God of Israel with *all his heart;* for he departed not from the sins of Jeroboam."

Brethren, let us be admonished: let us *not*, in our zeal to correct the errors of others, forget our *own hearts!* It is the state of the *heart*, and not of the *head*—it is the purity of our *affections*, and not of our *views*, that is to decide our eternal destiny. The *enemy* of our souls cares very little how correct our *views* are, or how enlightened our *heads*, if he can only keep our affections on the "perishing things" of this world. As a late English writer (Mr. Gurney) has said, "It has always been the device of Satan to transfer the seat of religion from the *heart* to the *head;* for it is infinitely easier to learn to *think* and *talk* correctly, than to practise the self-denying, heart-searching precepts of our holy religion."

Let us be exhorted, my brethren, if we wish to convert others to our *views*, to strive for *purity of heart*, for *love*, for *zeal!* Without these, all is vain! We *may* convert others to our *views* if we have nothing but *theory;* but they, also, will *only* be converted in *theory!* Men's *heads* may be converted by argument *alone;* but their *hearts* can only be converted by love! O how long will *frigid moonshine speculation and theory* be substituted for the *faith*, and *hope*, and *love*, and *zeal* of the ancient Christians!!

My brethren, let us "awake to righteousness;" let us put on the armor of light. We are called with a holy calling! We are called to "glory and courage!" We are called to "conquest and a crown!" Our citizenship is in heaven, whence also we look for the Saviour Christ Jesus the Lord, who will change our vile bodies, and make them like his own glorious body." O glorious hope!! But will the Lord, indeed, receive us to that ineffable bliss! Yes, if true and faithful, he will receive us to his presence where is fulness of joy! "Our feet shall stand within thy gates, O Jerusalem!" not Jerusalem, the "city of David;" but "the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem"—

"Whose walls are all of precious stones,
Most glorious to behold!
Whose gates are richly set with pearls,
Whose streets are paved with gold."

"If we look for such things, what manner of persons ought we to be!" Let us remember that "there shall in no wise enter into that city any thing that *defileth* or worketh abomination—

"Those holy gates forever *bar*
Pollution, sin, and shame;
None can obtain admission there
But followers of the Lamb."

But whither have I strayed? I sat down to write an essay on "positive ordinances;" but I have been borne along by an impulse that seemed irresistible. My pen followed my heart; and I had rather dwell an hour on the glories of the "celestial land," than to spend a lifetime upon the "dry bones" of controverted themes. However, I think I will have a fair beginning in my next; and I will (if the Lord permit) take up the principal ordinances, beginning with the prohibition

of the "tree of knowledge of good and evil," and endeavor briefly to show that they are not those *unmeaning ceremonies* that they are usually represented to be. We will try to divest them of that forbidding, skeleton-like aspect—that arbitrary frigidity and *mysterious nothingness* in which they are usually set forth. I trust we may discover that they have both life and beauty, and are admirably adapted to the attainment of the proposed ends—that they are every way adapted to promote *moral purity* and *devotion*, without which they are of no avail.

CHRISTIANOS.

CHRISTIANS AMONG THE SECTS.

KING & QUEEN, Va., July 6th, 1839.

Brother Campbell,

FINDING you intend to review the essays of CHRISTIANOS after he gets through, I have only to remark that I regret that he has become so "feverish" as to assume premises not sustained in his essays from any *Prophet* or *Apostle in the New Testament.* He would make your readers believe it is "trusting in the *externals of religion*" I am advocating. It is true *we* can know but little of the *internals of religion* but by the *externals.* "By *their fruits,*" says the Saviour, "*you* shall know them;" "A good man, out of the good treasure of his heart, bringeth forth good things; and an evil man, out of the evil treasure, bringeth forth evil things." Now the man whose heart has been purified by faith in the Son of God, reformed his life, and has been immersed for the remission of his sins, is, according to the gospel, a good man—until, by overt acts, he proves his "heart is not right in the sight of God."

When I spoke of "mental religion" I spoke correctly. I meant those who profess the Christian religion without obeying the commandments of the Saviour.

I have said Christianos has assumed premises: He says, "If any man has a controversy with *aught* in the former essays of Christianos, the controversy *must be with the scriptures*, and not with the *author* of the essays; for *he* has assumed no position of his own: but *his position* is contained *substantially in a hundred passages of scripture,** and most expressly in this—'I perceive of a truth that God is no respecter of persons; but that in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted of him.' Now I do not say, that the Pedobaptists do not fear God, but that they do not *begin* in a right way to work righteousness. Jesus taught John, 'It becomes us to *fulfil all righteousness.*' Now if *immersion*, upon our believing he is the Son of God, is a *righteous command*, and the first to be obeyed after repentance, then to talk of being *accepted of him*, without submitting to *this righteousness*, (he said must be fulfilled,) seems to me to be abandoning the scriptures or the teaching of the Saviour.

Christianos has deserted both the common and new version of the New Testament for the criticisms of a *Pedobaptist* to sustain him in his

* Why not say from Genesis to Malachi? Mr. Skinner will say the same.

"*Christians among the sects.*" He must bring from *the teaching or practice of the Apostles positive proof that they ever recognized any man or woman from any nation after the Christian kingdom was set up, that such were Christians, which he says is, without immersion into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.* Until this is done he writes in vain for that purpose. His quoting Dr. Campbell in opposition to the common version and new translation, proves his sayings—"Hence the most irresistible arguments produce no other effect upon the opposing party, than to arouse every energy for self-defence; for as one has said, 'In the heat of controversy *men would not know truth if it met them in the face.*'" I do not wish for better means than the three first essays of Christianos to refute him—indeed, he has refuted himself with his own arguments.

In his notice of my unanswerable argument I expected something better. The question is not whether "*all the citizens* of these United States are *genuine republicans*" but whether ALL FOREIGNERS OR ALIENS ARE CONSTITUTIONAL CITIZENS. It is not a party, brother Christianos, that I am pleading for. God has no party *in his kingdom.* If the kingdom of heaven is shut against any man or woman on earth that believes Jesus is the Son of God, sectarianism has, and is daily doing so. Every penitent believer in the Son of God is invited to come into the kingdom, and they complain the door is not *too "narrow-minded" with us, but too wide;* therefore they cannot enter. Such are the reasons the sects assign.

Having shown Christianos cannot prove any *sect* of professors are *Christians from the New Testament*, I will leave him in your hands until you get through. He has forgotten you said it was an *opinion of yours.*

I have been requested by intelligent brethren to examine a subject which I think they are more capable of doing than I am. It is this:—"What ought to be our course *with the sects* in relation to worship?" Under the *Jewish* economy there was but one set of worshippers, though there were *sects.* These *sects* never did prohibit each other from *uniting* together in the Temple worship. There were two kinds of *proselytes* or converts to the *national* religion: the one called Proselytes of the Gate, who worshipped the true God, *but did not submit to the Jewish rites:* the other, called *Proselytes of Justice, who submitted to the whole Jewish religion.* These last they allowed all privileges of this life and the life that is to come. It appears from the denunciations of Jesus Christ, that the Scribes and Pharisees were very active in making Proselytes of the Gate; but when made, they made them two-fold more the children of hell than themselves. It could not have been the *Proselytes of Justice* that they made; for the Saviour never would have condemned them for making such converts. But to the question.

By the *sects*, we do not wish to convey the idea, *at all times*, that the *Baptists* are included in our remarks. They do sometimes act as bad, if not worse, than any of the sects; but we hope they have, or will see see their error, and reform. All that reform, I can and will, when invited, unite with them to worship God. I am bound to believe *every penitent believer that has been immersed into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is a Christian; and as long as such give evidence of their love to the Saviour by keeping his commandments*, I shall recognize them as Christians, and unite with them to worship God.

There is not a Pedobaptist sect but what prefers the traditions of men to the commandments of Jesus. Even Dr. George Campbell, and Mr. Stewart of Andover, knew as well as any other men that *immersion alone* was administered by the Apostles to the believers; yet they prefer the traditions of the Fathers. Now how can a disciple worship with such men without being a transgressor against the commandments of Jesus? To worship God, is to worship him not only in spirit, but in or *according to truth.* Until it can be shown that the Apostles, by whose teaching we are to be saved, did command or practise infant sprinkling, and called a *sermon* worshipping God and keeping the commandments of Jesus, I am bound, as an obedient subject, to have nothing to do with such worship. I do not say I would not go any day *in the week* to hear what a Pedobaptist has to say; but *to neglect the worship of God with the disciples any Lord's day*, when I am able to attend, and no reasonable hindrance on the part of my family's health, is the broad road to apostacy. Look at those disciples that can neglect the Lord's day and his worship to VISIT even the Baptists, who will not let them break the loaf with them *once in three months*, and how cold and lifeless they are! Now as we cannot worship God with any sect according to "the truth," we surely cannot be in our duty with them who do not worship him in spirit and in the truth. Let us, then, strictly attend to our duty in the congregation of the disciples.

Before I close allow me to say how much pleased I am with your Essays on the "Morality of Christians" and "Education." These are subjects that ought to be examined and well understood by every disciple of Jesus.———Yours truly,

THOMAS M. HENLEY.

OUR NAME.

INTO what, or into whom have we been immersed? Into Calvin, Luther, Wesley, Campbell, or Reformation? If not, then why nickname us, or we nickname ourselves, when we assume or choose such designations? Shall we be called Disciples of Christ, or Christians? Why not call ourselves Christians? Not because we have another leader than Christ; for he is our teacher. We believe in him—were immersed into his death—and have thus put on Christ. But we have been anticipated. The term *Christian* in New England, and in some other sections of this land, is a name chosen and appropriated by a party who boast that they are *Unitarians*—disbelieve in baptism for the remission of sins—and refuse to celebrate the Lord's death as often as they celebrate his resurrection, &c. &c.

Were I, or any brother, to traverse much of New York, New England, and some other sections, and call ourselves *Christians*, as a party name, we should be admitted by all Unitarians and rejected by all of a different belief. One party would fraternize with us, while the others

would repudiate us and unchurch us, because of our supposed Unitarianism, Arianism, &c. For this reason we prefer an unappropriated name, which is indeed neither more nor less than the scriptural equivalent of *Christian;* for who were called Christians first at Antioch? They had a prior—a more ancient name. They were called *Disciples.* Disciples of whom? Of Christ. *Disciples of Christ* is, then, a more ancient title than *Christian,* while it fully includes the whole idea. It is, then, as divine, as authoritative as the name *Christian,* and more ancient. Besides, it is more descriptive; and, better still, it is unappropriated. It claims our preference for four reasons:—

1st. It is more ancient.

2d. It is more descriptive.

3d. It is more scriptural.

4th. It is more unappropriated.

1. Our first reason is indisputable; for *the disciples of Christ* were called Christians *first in Antioch.* Those who from the day of Pentecost were known throughout Judea, Galilee, Samaria, and among the Gentiles as disciples of Christ, were, at Antioch, many years afterwards, called, for the first time, *Christians.*

2. It is more *descriptive:* because many people are named after their country, or their political leaders, and sometimes after their religious leaders, who would feel it an insult to be called the pupils or disciples of the person whose name they bear. Germans, Franks, Greeks, Romans, Americans, Columbians, Jeffersonians, &c. do not describe the persons who bear their names; for they are not supposed to be the pupils of such men. Might not a stranger, an alien, imagine that *Christian.* like *American* or *Roman,* had some reference to country or some benefactor, or some particular circumstance, rather than scholarship? Disciple of Christ is, then, a more descriptive and definite designation than Christian.

3. It is more *scriptural.* Luke wrote his Acts some thirty years after the ascension. Now in his writings, which give at least thirty years' history of the primitive church, the word *Christian* occurs but twice—used only by the *Antiochans* and by king Agrippa; *but no disciple, as far as Luke relates, ever spoke of himself or brethren under that designation.* More than thirty times they are called *Disciples* in the Acts of the Apostles. Luke and other intelligent men call them often "*brethren*" and "*disciples,*" but never Christians. Again, we have the word Christian but *once* in all the epistles, and then in circumstances which make it pretty evident that it was used rather by the enemies, than by the friends of the brotherhood. Our proposition is, then, abundantly proved, that it is a more scriptural, and consequently a more authoritative and divine designation than Christian.

4. It is more unappropriated at the present time. Unitarians, Arians, and sundry other newly risen sects abroad, are zealous for the name *Christian;* while we are the only people on earth fairly and indisputably in the use of the title *Disciples of Christ.*

For these four reasons I prefer this designation to any other which has been offered. Can any one offer better reasons for a better name?

A. C.

MORALITY OF CHRISTIANS—*No. XVII.*

In discussing the morality of certain callings, and of the manner in which they are followed up by those in the profession, we had progressed so far as that of the speculators. There is such a thing as talking of politics and policies, and there is the driving of politics as a trade. Now while an Apostle might reasonably notice political events and political men in his travels, neither an Apostle nor a Christian could compatibly devote any portion of his time to the *trade* of politics. So while a merchant or a farmer may speculate upon crops and seasons and the prospects before him, and shape his course accordingly, neither of them, as Christians, could make speculation a trade.

What, then, is the *trade* of speculation? The art of living upon nothing, or the art of making a fortune by cunning. The capital stock of the speculator mainly consists in *cunning.* Money or property he may have; but it is not essential to his trade, so far as actual investment is concerned. But the speculator, properly so called, appears to best advantage in contrast with those of other callings; such as the farmer, the manufacturer, the merchant, the transporter, the professional man. The farmers are the creators of all the materials of life, so far as they are derived from the earth. The manufacturer furnishes us with all the necessaries of life, except food, and some of them take part even in that branch of business. The merchant neither creates nor manufactures any thing, but transfers the surplus labors of all classes. The transporter, whether by ship, boat, carriage, car, or dray, carries the produce of these three classes. Professional men prepare and apply the stores of literature, philosophic, medical, legal, and moral science to the conditions and wants of society. All these do something for society—give value for value received. They create, new-modify, transfer, transport, or minister something for man; while the speculator does none of these: but by his wit, information, or advantageous position, sets about elaborating from each and all of these, by the process

of mere cunning, all that he wants for his purposes in this life. He may, for instance, purchase and sell a thousand bales of cotton, or a thousand shares in some bank or corporation, and never touch one of them with the tip of his finger. He deals in the necessaries or comforts of life, and does no more than deal in them. He carries them to no place, he puts no improvement on them, increases them in no way. His whole employment, address, and art is simply to raise the price.—This he may attempt in a thousand ways, according to his capacity, foresight, times, and circumstances. His whole business is to buy cheap and sell dear—to consult no one's interest but his own. He aims not to change the quality, position, or place of any thing he buys; but simply its price. His talent for trade consists in the facility with which he can accomplish these things. If he have to ship or transport any thing he buys, it is because he could not otherwise dispose of it. That is foreign to his business—indeed, it belongs not to the speculator as such, but to the transporter.

Such is the speculator, and in these points he differs from the merchant. The proper merchant buys his goods in one market and sells them in another; he mediates between the producer, the manufacturer, the importer, the transporter, and the actual consumer who purchases for his own wants. He greatly facilitates and reduces the business of life. He generally pays himself for this, it is true; and with him it is always as much a matter of personal interest as it is of benevolence. Sometimes, indeed, (for the transition is easy to him,) he becomes a speculator; and then he only benefits himself at the expense of society.

This calling, in all its branches, is but sheer selfishness at work to enrich itself on the labors of others, by its own ingenuity, without any equivalent to them, and is wholly incompatible with the genius of Christian morality. It is naturally and necessarily oppressive in all its operations and tendencies. For example: A, the agriculturist grows the wheat, and sells it to M, the manufacturer; M, the manufacturer, sells it to D, the merchant; and D, the merchant, sells it to E, the eater. All this is natural and convenient, and consequently right and beneficial to society. But S, the speculator, interposed three times in these transactions, and every time made ten per cent. on his investments. In the first place, he interposed between the grower and the manufacturer, and bought the raw material. He held this for a few days, and sold it at the advance of ten cents on the hundred. Again he interfered between the manufacturer and the merchant, and by purchasing and holding the flour a few days, gained a second ten cents on the hundred. And last of all, he repurchased from the merchant, and sold to the transporter at another ten per cent. Now, by his cun-

ning, circumvention, and management, E, the eater, paid 30 cents more for his hundred pounds of flour than he would have done but for his interference and cupidity; and neither the farmer, the manufacturer, nor the merchhnt got one cent more for his labor than he would have got from E, the eater, had S, the speculator, never appeared upon the theatre.

From this plain view of the operations of the speculator, the morality of his calling, and his use to society may be appreciated.

But I should be sorry to think that any of my readers would conclude that only those who follow this business for a trade are reprehensible according to Christian morality. Those who only take a a hand at it occasionally, when a good opportunity occurs, are also culpable to the whole amount of their negociations, and are a real injury to society.

I will be told that such persons are nevertheless in some sense useful to society, advancing the price of the articles in which they trade.—This is often a real loss to the great majority, and seldom any true advantage to the minority. But it is not necessary to our purpose to prove that they are of no manner of use to society: for serpents, toads, and moschettoes may, indeed, be of advantage; but this will not prove that we should resemble them. Neither is utility the standard of morality. All operations in things unlawful, inhumane, and oppressive, are immoral in despite of all the good which Heaven may extort from their inhumanity and injustice. So far, then, we have endeavored to describe a calling in society essentially immoral, and to distinguish it from those, that, although they may in some respects partially resemble it, are, notwithstanding, radically and essentially different.

A. C.

SIN—*A DIALOGUE.*

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 271.]

Philander. WHEN we come to consider the reason, or reasons, on account of which, sin, with all its direful consequences, was admitted into the universe of God our Father, we find our view much more circumscribed, for want of the clear light of revelation, than when the place and manner of its origin were inquired for. It becomes us, therefore, to be more cautious in our advances, and less confident in our conclusions. To know the *reasons* or *causes* of things is, indeed, a happiness not often permitted to us. We readily perceive *effects*, just

as we do the morning breeze which now feels to us so refreshing; which is seen to move the graceful boughs, and is heard to murmur amongst the foliage by which we are overshadowed; but we know as little of *causes*, for the most part, as we do of the region from whence this breeze has come to us, or of the quarter to which it goes. We can easily observe the bright waters of the fountain which issue from that mountain's side, but their secret sources mock our scrutiny, and defy our researches.

Eugenio. Yet, although we cannot trace the course of the wind, or pursue the fountain into the deep recesses where it originates, we can readily and certainly infer their uses, and the reasons of their creation, from the purposes which they accompiish or subserve. May we not, then, with some degree of certainty, thus judge of the reasons for which sin is permitted to exist?

Philander. This is precisely the matter before us, and it would not be very easy to show that we should not in this case, as in others, thus reason from the effect to the design, or that we could not in this way obtain some insight into the uses or purposes of sin. For that sin must be designed to accomplish some important purpose in the universe, or that else it would not be allowed to exist, will not, I presume, be disputed by any one.

In the first place, then, it manifestly gives occasion to a display and development of the Divine character to both men and angels, which could not, so far as we can reason or imagine, have taken place without it. What could men or angels have known of justice, or mercy; of long-suffering, or condescension; and of the infinite power and wisdom of God, if circumstances had not arisen which called for a manifestation of these attributes? The opposition of an adversary, and such a one too as Satan, and the conflict of antagonist principles which has been occasioned by his means, have elicited manifestations of the Divine character, which, so far as we know, we could not otherwise have had at all; or which at least, (our confidence in the Divine wisdom should lead us to say,) we could not have had so well in any other way. That such *has been* the effect of sin, like the dark ground of the picture, to exhibit in bold relief the attributes of God, is incontrovertible. And we must conclude that it was permitted for this among other purposes, or suppose events to have occurred unforeseen by Omniscience, and unavoidable by Omnipotence. Indeed, if we may deduce the design of the whole drama from what is actually expressed in relation to certain scenes and actors in it, this conclusion would be sustained even by revelation; for while we are invited in relation to some events to "behold the goodness and severity of God," it is in respect to others

distinctly stated that it was "in order to show his wrath and make his power known that God endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction, as well as to make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had before prepared for glory." And in the case of Pharaoh he says to him, "In very deed for this cause have I raised thee up for to show in thee my power, and that my name may be known throughout all the earth." Nor is it easy to perceive how the Divine goodness should be in any way more implicated by such a conclusion respecting the opposition and rebellion of the leader of the apostate host, than in the case of his minion the king of Egypt, who was given over to his power that he might harden his heart and strengthen his hand to the utmost of his ability against the God of the Hebrews.

Eugenio. The Divine goodness certainly could not be implicated in either case, when it is remembered that these displays of character were necessary to, and productive of, an ultimate happiness and perfection to which this creation could not otherwise so well attained. Is it not, however, written that "the LORD hardened Pharaoh's heart"?

Philander. It is. And it is also stated that "an *evil* spirit *from the* LORD troubled Saul." Job too attributes his afflictions to God, and says, "Know now that God hath overthrown me, and hath compassed me with his net. He hath fenced up my way that I cannot pass, and hath set darkness in my paths. He hath stripped me of my glory, and taken the crown from my head. He hath destroyed me on every side." And a little further on he pathetically exclaims, "Have pity upon me, have pity upon me, O ye my friends; for the hand of GOD hath touched me." God charges himself, or allows himself to be charged with, whatever is done by his express permission, even though the agent be an evil spirit, seeking to gratify his own malevolence, as is clearly revealed to us in the case of Job. This case, indeed, serves as a key to unlock many things which appear at first secret and mysterious.—Satan, with that impudence by which he is characterized, having presented himself among the sons of God upon a day of audience, has the character of Job presented to him, as remaining pre-eminently unspotted by the evil which Satan had brought into the world. But he, having formed (from self-judgment, perhaps; like many men) the grossest conceptions of human nature, and the poorest opinion of those sterling and noble principles by which the Lord, a better judge, knew Job to be governed, attributes his piety to selfish motives, and the mere temporal and transitory circumstances which surrounded him. He is permitted to put him to the proof by taking away these adventitious circumstances. And what is the result? The excellency of these

divine principles is brilliantly displayed; the Divine character exhibited in many points as it is not in any other part of revelation; the mysteries of Providence explained; and the malice of Satan so entirely defeated that the means which he used to destroy Job, caused his latter end to be blessed more than his beginning. Thus, as James says, "We see the end of the Lord how that the Lord is very pitiful and of tender mercy." And if the dealings of Satan with a single individual have given to us an assurance so consoling, how great will be the sum, and how deep the import of the revelations of the Divine character presented, at the *denouement*, in the biographies of men and angels!

There is also an incident in the life of Ahab, where the Prophet Micaiah for a moment withdraws the curtain, and affords us a glimpse of the Divine councils, which may further illustrate the subject. He represents the Lord as "sitting upon his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him on his right hand and on his left. And the Lord said, Who shall persuade Ahab that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-Gilead? And one said on this manner, and another said on that manner. And there came forth a spirit and stood before the Lord, and said, I will persuade him. And the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go forth and I will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said, Thou shalt persuade him and prevail also: go forth and do so. Now, therefore," says Micaiah to Ahab, "the Lord has put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets, and the Lord hath spoken evil concerning thee."

From all this we learn that Satan himself and all his wicked subordinates are under a restraint like wild beasts in a chain, and that although they have constantly the disposition to deceive mankind to their ruin, and to afflict them in every possible way, that they are not permitted to do so, unless men by wickedness have put themselves without the pale of the Divine protection, and deserve to be given up to their cruelty, as criminals were wont to be to lions; or unless in cases where their malice will become its own punishment, and redound to the ultimate happiness of those who are for a time subjected to it. Such being their nature, we find them at all times ready to offer their services, and even to solicit employment. Thus Satan desired to have Peter in his power, who received strength to endure the trial through our Lord's intercession.

But to come to the case of Pharaoh: As David was a man after God's own heart for a certain purpose, so he found Pharaoh a proper instrument—a man of the right mettle, for the object to be accomplished—to wit, to make known his power. But it was not in human nature to

withstand such repeated judgments as were required for this object, and also for the punishment of the tyranny and oppression of the Egyptians, and therefore it became necessary that his heart should be still more hardened, so that he might resist to the very last, and give scope for these manifestations of Divine power. Now we need be at no loss to judge through what agency the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart, and hurried him headlong to the destruction which he deserved. Thus the sculptor, who desires to chisel out a statue, selects for the purpose a tool, not of wood or any yielding substance, but of iron, which is not only possessed of its native hardness, but is also steeled and tempered for his use by the agency of the furnace. R. R.

LETTER FROM HENRY GREW.

In conformity with my principles and my custom of giving impartially both sides on all matters worthy of discussion, upon all questions of Christian faith and manners, I insert the following communication from my friend Mr. Grew. We care nothing for any reflections pronounced upon our course in the apology made for his censures so freely bestowed, as we thought, in the communication alluded to. We allow to him the full benefit of all the reprisals he can make, our position in the affair being unchanged.

"*Brother Campbell,*

Agreeably to your request, I sent the last number of the Millennial Harbinger to the Editor of the Christian Palladium, with an earnest request to have "the whole of (your) remarks" copied into the Christian Palladium. Yesterday I received a letter from the Editor, informing me that the committee had decided against the publication of the article. I regret this decision, but have no power to reverse it. I am not even connected with their particular denomination.

Having done all I can to secure a compliance with your request, and having been misapprehended, in your remarks, in relation to the ground of my complaint, and grossly misrepresented (I say not wilfully) in reference to my views of the character of the Son of God, I appeal to your own sense of common justice to determine whether or not I have a claim to a brief space in your periodical for the following defence.

You ask, "Ought he (Mr. G.) not to have been assured that I had received his letter before he took occasion to hold me up to the reproach of all the readers of a paper from whose pages he well knew I was positively proscribed?" To this question I unhesitatingly answer affirmatively, *if it is true* that I have reproached you, *because you did not publish my communication.* So far from my censures being based on the "hypothesis" you represent them to be, I plainly and repeatedly declared in the same communication, "Mr. C.'s right to decline publishing my communication is not questioned." More than this: I

added, "*Had he simply done this, the present article would never have been written.*" Is it possible that I could write thus, and at the same time pour upon you "invectives, censure, and malediction" for doing only what I declared you had a right to do?

That I have censured you, (though not with malediction,) I admit; but for a very different matter from what you represent. For what, in truth, did I censure you? Please refer to my article and read the charge, "*trifling with the awful subject of the penalty of Jehovah's holy law,*" &c. This I sincerely think you have done in the epistle signed "William Penn," viewing it in its connexion with that of "Solomon Virtuoso," which immediately follows, whether you referred to me, Silas E. Shepard, Mr. Montgomery, or any other person. The question, "Where is the proof of my refusal to publish his communication?" is, therefore, irrelevant to the main point between us. The question at issue is, whether or not I have acted consistently with Christian love and faithfulness to you and God's holy truth in reproving you, as I have, *for the manner* in which you did, at least "for a time," decline a discussion of the subject you had yourself introduced! Does not my brother perceive, on a candid review of the matter, that the ridiculous position and association he assigned the awful subject of future retribution, was incompatible with its magnitude and solemnity?* How do you prove my allegation "glaringly unjust" by stating that you declined the discussion "only for a time?" My complaint is *against the manner in which you treated the subject*, whether you were willing to discuss the subject then, in future, or never.

You remark, "I did, moreover, make a special reserve with a special reference to one of those questions as of some 'practical value;' promising, should its utility be more apparent, to attend to it after some matters on hand were disposed of. And could he (Mr. G.) not but perceive that this was that very point?" Now I assure you that I had no such perception.† How could I clearly perceive this when the excepted subject *was not designated*, and when other subjects of "practical value" were referred to in the fictitious epistles? For example, the subject of "physical and moral ability and inability;" a subject, in my view, of no less "practical value." Now it is demonstrable, I think, that one of these important subjects, to say no more, was treated in an improper manner.

Unimportant as is the question, "Does Mr. Grew offer any evidence that I ever saw or read his communication?" permit me to state, first, the fact that it was forwarded by mail in full time to be received before the 8th of October, (the time of your departure.) Secondly, the fact that the *subject*, *date*, and *signature* of the fictitious epistle in the January number, agreed with the *subject*, *date*, and *residence* of the author of my own communication. Is not this *some* evidence that you had *some knowledge* of my letter when you wrote that of "William Penn?"‡

* Not "the *subject* of future retribution," but his theory of it. The reader will please examine those letters alluded to, and my reply to Mr. Grew's censures, in the April number, 1839.

† I had certainly formed a higher conception of the perceptive powers of my friend, than he is now willing I should entertain: for surely if any of the points alluded to in my fictitiously real correspondents was of much or any practical value, it was that of the penalty of a despised gospel.

‡ "Some knowledge" I might have had from my clerk or correspondents at home, at the time William Penn wrote his letter, without affording any premises for such imputations as those alleged by Mr. Grew.

I wish that I could here close my defence. When, O when shall the strifes of Zion cease, and the reign of love and peace succeed?

It grieves me to see one, whom, with all his imperfections I esteem and love, taking his position with those who, instead of answering my arguments, misrepresent my sentiments respecting my honored and adored Saviour, On page 228 of the Millennial Harbinger for May last, the late "Editor of the Christian Palladium" and "Mr. Grew" are represented as having "decided that Emanuel was a mere Prophet like Moses, only further inspired, and that his death for our sins is only the comparative degree of Paul's and Peter's for us." Thus my brother attempts to cast upon me the odium of denying the fundamental truth of the great and glorious sacrifice for sin, which the Father of mercies has appointed, in order "that he might be just and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus;" a truth which has ever been cherished in my heart, as the foundation of my hope of immortality, since I first found pardon and peace at the cross. If I have ever spoken or written evil of this precious truth, "bear witness of the evil; but if well, why smitest thou me?" In the Millennial Harbinger for March, 1834, page 119, you will find my unchanged sentiment on this subject thus plainly expressed: "It pleased the Father to make his life *an offering for sin*," &c. On page 309, M. H., for July, 1833, you find the following: "The term Lamb of God, which is so beautifully significant of *the great propitiatory sacrifice* our Father has appointed," &c. On page 396 of the M. H., for August, 1833, I remarked, "Considering the dignity and perfection of *the real sufferer*, the true Son of God, made before and "better than the angels;" his voluntary humiliation and perfect obedience unto death, is perfectly adequate to the design of infinite wisdom, to declare the righteousness of God in justifying him who believes in Jesus."

The sentiment that the divine and matchless Son of God died for us, "not more expiatively than" "John Huss and Jerome of Prague," is as abhorrent to my soul as it is to yours.

In respect to the inference of comparative gratitude due to Jesus and Paul, which you draw from what you represent as being my premises, it is sufficient for me to deny the premises. State my sentiments fairly, then argue as much as you please to prove that they are inconsistent with each other or with the word of the Lord. If you choose to argue, that because I deny, what you avow, that there is "society in God;" therefore I ought, in your opinion, to deny that the death of Jesus Christ is an atoning sacrifice any more than that of Paul, I will not complain if I am convinced. I consider your idea (if you have any) of "society in God," as entirely inconsistent with the divine unity; but what would you think of me if I should declare to all your readers that Mr. C. has decided that the doctrine of the divine unity is false, and that there are three supreme Gods, or at least two?

Very respectfully and affectionately do I submit this communication to your candid consideration, and to that of your readers, praying that we may forbear one another in love, and have our minds and hearts more absorbed in the one great and good cause of Him who has loved us and given himself for us.

Yours in the enduring hope,

HENRY GREW."

But without again mooting the endless genealogies and speculations upon the personal dignity of the Messiah, and the value of his death, (with me two of the most cardinal points in the universe,) I will simply observe,—that I had no idea that I was misrepresenting the views of my correspondent. Far be it that I should, on such vital points, either misconceive or misrepresent him. I am not, however, as yet convinced that I have misconceived him, though he may object to the inferences drawn from his premises. I therefore allow him the privilege of speaking for himself to my numerous readers, and thus leave it to them to draw their own inferences.

Any one, however, that tells me that he regards my Lord as having been only "made before the angels," as he has now expressed it, (as to his antecedent or divine nature,) puts a real expiatory sacrifice wholly out of my vision: for could any being, "made before," or since the angels, make reconciliation for iniquity, introduce an *everlasting* justification, and put an end to all sin-offerings? Nay, could all the angels of God, though incarnate, present for man a *real* sin-offering, and justify God in justifying sinners?

When any one conceives of the Godhead, or Deity, as a mathematical unit, and denies society in the true and proper Divinity that "fills heaven and earth," I am a stranger to the reasons and the principles that authorize him, in affirming his belief in a *real sin-offering*, expiatory of the sin of a world; made and perfected by this *pre-angelic being*, between whom and the Godhead there is a gap, a space which the whole universe could not fill. I hope, then, I will be excused for not comprehending the essential difference between the death of Paul and of Jesus Christ, so far as the putting away of sin is concerned. They were both creatures of God, of different ranks and natures; and, as such, were under a law claiming from them, on their own account, all the homage and obedience which they could yield to it. The one may have been incomparably more noble and divine than the other; but they are equally dependent upon God for their existence, and incapable of doing more than their own personal duties. Such is not the object of my faith, hope, and love. A. C.

MESSRS. FISHER AND WALLER.

Called upon by brother Robinson, of Madisonville, Ind., for so much of the history of T. J. Fisher, the *revivalist*, as pertained to his expulsion from the Christian church at Middletown, Pa., in March, 1831, immediately before my departure on my southern tour in September last, from my own recollections I gave a statement of the matter so far as pertained to his denying that he ever "was connected with any of our churches, *by letter*, *baptism*, *experience*, *or any other way*." Overwhelmed at this total disregard of truth, I felt it due to the brother who addressed me, and the whole community, to state the fact—that said "*Fisher was once reckoned a brother among the Disciples, and was a member of a church near West Middletown, Pa., from which he was excluded for disorderly conduct.*"

Every word of this I have proved by irrefragable testimony, and can

again and again prove in any court civil or ecclesiastic. Two letters only have been published—one from Dr. Pinkerton, on whose motion in said church he was expelled; and one from Mr. James Sloan, a Presbyterian Minister, of honorable standing in that denomination, then a teacher in the seminary in which Mr. Fisher was a student, by my direction.

The reason why this testimony was laid before the community, rather than other vouchers from the church itself, was, because Messrs. Fisher and Waller *denied the charges* above specified in the Banner and Pioneer of the 27th December last, and called it "a *hellish meal* of a good man's name," and denied that there was any such church at the time and place above specified, affirming my statement to be "*untrue;*" the Editors giving, however, no vouchers—but "*if* their information was correct"—the information of the accused revivalist himself, for no other name was given! Thus I was obliged to look for testimony out of the church. I called on Mr. Sloan, because Mr. Fisher himself, in his letter to the Post-Master, Middletown, seeking for help out of his falsehoods, inquired for several persons, at the head of whom he placed Mr. James Sloan. Mr. Waller, by the way, in his usual delicacy and honorable regard for truth, with Fisher's letter before his eyes, denies that it was *James* Sloan, *first* on the list; but *Robert* Sloan, *third* on the list, that Mr. Fisher called for! Was there ever a more barefaced attempt at imposition! If the gentleman will allow his passion to subside so far as that he can see with his eyes, and look again at his *brother* Fisher, he will see how much credit is due to his word in other matters, when two direct falsehoods are asserted in one breath touching the letter which he had just printed. James Sloan is the *first*, and Robert Sloan the *fifth* name on the list of the persons called for by Mr. Fisher. But the same truth-loving spirit that tells this story would have said, 'Had I given the testimony of *Robert*, rather than of *James* Sloan, that because *Robert* was a member of the church, and *James* a Presbyterian Minister, I preferred *ex-parte* testimony to that which i impartial and foreign.' Yes, as sure as Mr. Waller has falsified twice on this point, he would have said it, soon as he had learned that *Robert* is still a member of the church, and *James* a minister of another denomination. See how the fox has entrapped himself!!

Now, courteous reader, how do Mr. Waller and his unfortunate ward proceed in this case? Do they frankly and penitently confess that Satan in an evil hour had got into their heart and tempted them to falsehood, and then to collusion to cover it? or do they deny the charge by producing testimony of their innocence? They do not. Mr. Waller, knavishly enough to be sure, says Mr. Williams' letter is testimony! Against what? Any thing that I have said about his exclusion? Was Mr. Williams at Middletown to know any thing about these matters? Mr. Fisher might as well produce a letter from Beverly A. Hicks, of Fayette county, Ky., proving that when a Baptist he ordered all my works to be sent him, even before the year 1830, in proof that he could not have been expelled in 1831 from the church at Middletown. This would be just as much to the point of his expulsion from the church as Mr. Williams' letter.

But he says of my June reply to his December budget of slanderous and defamatory epithets, here comes "Mr. Campbell's *six months search*

into the school-boy days of brother Fisher." *Six months' search!!!* Having in March last been in his own town of Louisville, on my return from a six months' absence, of which he was apprized; and having been in Georgia in December when his slanderous budget appeared—these facts being public as my publication, with what conscience could he call my June reply to his December letter, *sent me in May*, (in answer to letters forwarded by me to Kentucky on my return;) I say, with what regard for *truth* and *moral principle* could he call this reply my "*six months' search*"!! Alas! for the souls of them who are led by such truth-speaking scribes and elders!!

"The school-boy days"!! Poor boy! Unfortunate youth! A preacher with a letter in his pocket from a Baptist church, certifying his standing among the Baptists in Kentucky—turning school-boy, and again sent out by the Baptists in his "school-boy days" to make revivals! Truly, this school-boy Fisher is a singular *child!* a prodigy of precocious pulpit genius, whose love of the marvellous has pre-eminently qualified him for telling wonderful tales!

It may yet be with Fisher as it was with a certain Mr. Winters, of Pittsburg memory, whose zeal against our heresy betrayed him into similar follies. His character was sent me from Wales and England. I warned the Baptists of the impostor. They set about defending him after the style of Messrs. Waller & Company—and abusing me as a "*slanderer*," forsooth! But public opinion and the documents which I produced ultimately compelled the Baptists to expose and exclude him for CERTAIN LOVE AFFAIRS, of which, in their "school-boy days," young preachers are exceedingly susceptible. I would, by the way, advise such "school-boy" preachers always to get married before they set out on a preaching crusade against heterodoxy in opinion.

"We *proved*," says Mr. Waller, "that brother Fisher joined the 1st Baptist Church, in Pittsburgh, the 6th of March, 1831." Very good! And I *proved* that Mr. Fisher was expelled the church of Pleasant Hill about the same time; and it can be again and again proved by as good men and as strong guarantees as the State of Pennsylvania affords. And what law, reason, logic, or common sense is there in proving that T. J. F., or any other person, was legally married on the 6th of May, 1830, in defence that he had not been divorced in April preceding!! I shall hold Messrs. Waller, Fisher & Co. to be yet in their "school-boy days" if they pretend any defence of themselves from such shameless nonsense and imposture. Or is it possible that these gentry knowingly prevaricate, on the ground that I from recollection, or the printer from mistake, dated Mr. Gano's letter in 1831, rather than 1830! Honest men, indeed, and true! Seeing that I have proved, and shall again append to this document other vouchers in and out of the church, that Fisher was expelled as aforesaid—not AFTER, as Mr. Waller, reckless of truth, has presumed to assert; but BEFORE he renounced "Campbellism."

Mr. Waller, most singularly regardless of truth and character, says because I produced the testimony of Dr. Pinkerton and Mr. Sloan, I could find none in the church at Pleasant Hill or West Middletown, as if they had not both been there at the time in which these events transpired! But listen to the man:—"No ingenuity can evade the

conclusion—every one must see its force—that Mr. C. is a *slanderer* in the most odious acceptation of that word; a wanton vilifier of another man's character"—because he did not go to Middletown and the church of Pleasant Hill for testimony. And why not go there? Because "the charges were false and slanderous, and known to be such by the Pleasant Hill church and the citizens of West Middletown." And at another time Mr. W. asserts there was no such church. And again I must show the name of *Thomas* J. Fisher, written by his own hand, to a church covenant. Well, we are commanded to be patient, and not to give place to passion, or feeling, or resentment; and so I shall let this tissue of "school-boy" abuse await the judgment of the great day. Mr. W. knows, or ought to know, that we have no such custom as every member signing with his own hand a church covenant. I cannot but call this a mere trick—a despicable evasion to cheat his readers! I could not myself, nor one in a thousand of our brethren, prove that we are members of any given church by showing our names, written by our own hands, to a church covenant. In fact, his putting it upon this issue, will, to all intelligent men, convey the assurance that *he knows in his heart* that T. J. Fisher was as *formal* and as *real* a member of the church at Pleasant Hill as any member in it, and that he was expelled under the charge of immoral conduct from that church as aforesaid. Yes, and all the whitewashing of all the Baptist editors in America will never make any thing out of Thomas J. Fisher than an excluded and impenitent fugitive from our communion, imposing on the simplicity of many good Baptists, through the foolish and wicked opposition to us and our principles, on the part of a few interested and unprincipled men.

The abuse pronounced on Mr. Sloan, who is basely, wantonly, and most wickedly presented as signing a letter which I wrote; and on Dr. Pinkerton for his clear, modest, and definite testimony—than whom Kentucky cannot produce, of his years, a more excellent and upright professor of religion; shows how honorable and upright men are to be sacrificed or most basely slandered to save such foul spirits from that exposure which benevolence compels and authorizes. Instead of an effort to defend themselves from imputations demanding a grave investigation, they resort to the most wanton abuse of those who testify against their evil deeds. What shall we think of the morality of the man, who, without a shadow of proof, attempts to accomplish, by dastardly insinuation, what he dare not affirm—that Dr. Pinkerton was the person to whom Parker gave evidence of his skill in counterfeiting, and who afterwards gave him letters of recommendation as a Christian brother! I never read a more infamous or more wicked attempt from any man to injure and blight the character of a young gentleman and Christian of unsullied reputation, both as a regular practitioner of medicine and a Christian, than that of Mr. Waller, the guardian of the *famous* revivalist.

But we have no intention of descending to reply to such unclean and defamatory spirits, and shall be content to adduce a few more witnesses of the truth of our history of the expulsion of Mr. Fisher, and of his standing in West Middletown. Since Mr. Waller demands more vouchers, he shall have them. I may add, that I have too high an opinion both of the religion of one part of the Baptists, and of the pride

of another, to think that they will long countenance such an impudent hypocrite as this darling child—this ward of their "Banner and Pioneer" of the West. I predict, the people we call "the world" will not long sustain him. We shall first introduce a few witnesses who happened to fall in the way of a member of the church on Monday morning last:—

"We are so far acquainted with the history of the church at Pleasant Hill, in the environs of West Middletown, Pa., as to state, that it has existed there for a good many years, and that a certain Thomas J. Fisher was once known and regarded generally as one of its prominent members. But having fallen into some scandals, or offences, was excluded from said church; and then he did, in our hearing, in a public discourse, renounce his connexion with that church; and, leaving both it and the Academy at Pleasant Hill, went to Pittsburg sometime in the winter or spring of 1831.

[Signed] JAMES M'FADDEN,
WILLIAM M'KEEVER, Jun.
JOHN BOYD.
JOHN SHARP.

The above we know to be true, except the discourse, which we did not listen to.

THOMAS M'KEEVER,
JOHN SMILEY,
SAMUEL BUSHFIELD,
A. C HAMILTON.

West Middletown, Pa, August 19th, 1839."

All the above gentlemen are respectable citizens of West Middletown, or its vicinity; amongst whom is one of the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas for Washington county—viz. Thomas M'Keever, Esq.; and also two Justices of the Peace—viz. Messrs. M'Fadden and Boyd. They are also of diverse religious parties and persuasions.

Mr. Waller asks for the testimony of brother M'Keever, in whose house Mr. Fisher boarded, and on whose premises the church of Pleasant Hill met then and since, and of which Mr. M'Keever has long been a member. He shall have it:—

"TO ALL WHOM IT MAY CONCERN.

This to certify, That a congregation of Disciples has regularly met at Pleasant Hill ever since the year 1830; and that Thomas J. Fisher was regularly received into said church, on the recommendation of A. Campbell, in October of that year, as at that time in fair standing among the Disciples. The said Fisher for several months having boarded in my family. I had a good opportunity to become acquainted with his Christian character; and I am sorry to say, that it was not such as became his profession; and that in levity, folly, *obscenity*, he continued to degenerate, till it became the duty of the church to admonish him; and finally, on seeing no improvement, but a continual deterioration, he was finally expelled for general bad conduct and contumacy of the church, in March, 1831. *After* which, and not before, he made a public renunciation of "Campbellism," and yet without any crimination either of the church or of A Campbell. From my house he went to Pittsburg, and it was said joined the Baptists about the time of his exclusion.

MATTHEW M'KEEVER.

Pleasant Hill, August 16th, 1839."

He seems also to be anxious to hear from Robert Sloan, as well as from James Sloan. We shall gratify him in this particular also:—

"*Brother Campbell*,

In compliance with your request, I give you the facts in relation to my introduction to T. J Fisher, and my intercourse and acquaintance with him. On Lord's day, in the Autumn of 1830, we were first introduced to each other as Christian brethren, at Bethany; where and when the congregation was addressed by yourself, a brother from the East, (whose name I have forgotten.) and Mr. Fisher in conclusion. Previous to the assembly being dismissed, Mr. Fisher gave notice that he would address the citizens of West Middletown that evening on the subject of the reformation.

Some short time after he became my fellow-student at Pleasant Hill Seminary, where a congregation of Disciples met every Lord's day, over whom brother J. Bryant then presided. Mr. Fisher frequently expressed to me his disappointment that he was not chosen to preside in preference to br. Bryant; and in consequence of being prevented by the church from addressing the public, manifested much coolness toward the Disciples, and an almost total disregard of Christian duty. His levity of conduct, immoralities, and unchristian

demeanor became a matter of general observation, brought reproach upon the Christian cause, and was therefore deemed a matter deserving church censure. He was accordingly, after much unheeded reproof, in connexion with Mr. Giles H. Peabody, from Vermont, a constant companion and bosom friend, whose conduct was alike frivolous and unbecoming the Christian profession, cited to appear before the church to answer for disregard to the laws of Christ's house. This case was investigated on Saturday evening, February 19th, 1831. Mr. Peabody, refusing to make any concessions, was excluded on Lord's day morning, the 20th. Mr. Fisher made acknowledgment of his faults; and promising reformation, was retained. A few days afterward he accompanied Mr. Peabody to Pittsburg; and being known there to be guilty of much *frivolity*, *obscenity*, and *falsehood*, was cited a second time to appear before the church on the 5th of March, 1831; which, failing to do, he was finally excluded from the communion of the Disciples on Lord's day morning, the 6th of March, 1831.* Such is my acquaintance with Mr. Fisher's religious course.

ROBERT R. SLOAN.

Dutch Fork, Pa., August 17th, 1839."

We shall conclude our testimony with that of Mr. Waller himself—I mean the Editor of the Banner—against Mr. Fisher, his own ward. These veritable brothers have not good memories, and yet they need them as much as any two persons in their line. Mr. Fisher appears in the opening of his defence from his own misdeeds, denying from "the sacred desk," in the character of a "revivalist of religion," that he ever "was connected with any of our churches by *letter*, *baptism*, *experience*, *or any other way*." On this ground the Banner sets up his defence: but finally, the light breaking, most reluctantly indeed, upon Mr. Waller, he admits his friend falsified—that he was a member, *in some way*, of one of our churches, and was excluded; but deposes that he was cast out *after* he had renounced "Campbellism," not before! This we have proved to be a falsehood. But still we give him credit for some truth—so far as he deposes that his friend Fisher falsified in denying that he was ever connected with any of our churches. 'You *were* connected, Mr. Fisher,' says Mr. Waller, 'and you ought not to have denied it; you *were* cast out also, Mr. Fisher,' says Mr. Waller, 'and you ought not to have denied that either; but (to save appearances with the Baptists) you ought to have said you were cast out *after* you had renounced Campbellism.'

We shall let these worthy brethren in the truth satisfactorily adjust their mutual accusations and criminations: for my part, I do not believe one word either of them says on any subject in which it can possibly be their interest to falsify!

Mr. Waller wisely anticipated these disclosures; and therefore said he would not allow his readers to see them in his paper; in other words, he would not republish them unless I should transfer all his Grub-street billingsgate to our pages! This overture was made at too late a day to be accepted. If Mr. Fisher can make any defence in language that decent people can read, we shall, according to our rule, let him be heard; provided the Banner continues our defence. But a writer who, like Mr. Waller, outrages every principle of decency, good

* Br Pinkerton has *substantially*—but, not having the dates, has not *circumstantially* related the affair. Mr. Fisher was first before the church on the 19th February; and confessing his faults—such as his having said of two young ladies that presented themselves for baptism, he "would like to squeeze them before he baptized them," and such other immoral and impious sayings; and, professing sorrow, he was forgiven and retained for the time being. But new and repeated, and more outrageous offences being proved against him, he was called upon to appear before the church on the evening of the 5th March. He, being assured he would then be excluded, posted off to Pittsburg, and joined the Baptist church in that place on the afternoon of the very same day in which he was excluded at Pleasant Hill. Without any notice of this, a few days afterwards, he returned to Middletown, and invited the public to hear him formally renounce "Campbellism."

breeding, morality, and religion, as he has done in this affair, shall never pollute our pages.

I sympathize most sincerely with many excellent Baptists in Kentucky and in the West, who have been most grievously afflicted with such scribes and apologists as Messrs. Waller and Chambers. I regret that I have been compelled to notice such a man as T. J. Fisher; but I dare not, when fairly called upon, shrink from a duty, however painful to myself, and however ungrateful to many, which I owe to the whole community, of sustaining truth, morality, and religion, against the rude and ruffian assaults of hypocrisy, imposture, and impiety.

A. C.

NEWSPAPER VERACITY,

Exemplified by the National Ægis.

Soon after the Mormon Bible was published, a sect of fanatics from Ohio, called Campbellites, passed through New York, and heard of the golden plates. They called upon Smith, and many of them were converted to his faith. With them was Sidney Bigelow, who was a man of eloquence and great popularity among them.

National Ægis.

Mr. Editor,

The above scrap was cut from a paper published at Peoria, Ill., and credited as appears. It was preceded by the story of finding the "*plates*," as related by Smith. I was much astonished at the ignorance of the article, and the deliberate manner in which the editor of the "National Ægis" speaks to his own shame. In the first place—"A sect of *fanatics* from Ohio, *called* Campbellites," were converted to his faith. Now the writer of this article is quite extensively acquainted in Ohio and New York, and also with a class of people "*called* Campbellites;" and can certify, with truth, from actual observation, that, for many years, there has been no other one cause which has operated so effectually to destroy fanaticism in Ohio and New York, as the teaching and influence of the "*called* Campbellites." But as proof that the Ægis *knew* much less than it has *said* of the affair, we mention the name of Sidney Bigelow. No man wearing that name and character has ever been among the Mormons or the other party alluded to.—Sidney Rigdon was, no doubt, the name intended; but the mistake in that name is proof positive that that paper is also ignorant of the Mormon history—as much so as to unite Cromwell and Cesar as twin-brothers, would be that the writer was ignorant of English and Roman history.

If the editor had said that some *fanatics* from among the sect called Campbellites were converted to Mormonism, he would have told the truth. But, to interpret the whole matter, it would appear to me thus: —An attempt, through feigned ignorance, by a religious zealot, to associate you and those laboring *with* you, (not *for* you,) for a restoration of the primitive order and discipline of the church of God, with the folly, ignorance, and madness of Mormonism and latter-day-spirituality. If this be not the case, the Ægis, and those papers which have copied the above article, will make the necessary retraction.

I am not at all disposed to advocate Mormonism, nor any other wild and mysterious fanaticism; but what do the Mormons more than many of their wise neighbors? Nay, are they not much more consistent and reasonable? The sectarian spirit of our day says that God sends numerous messengers throughout the world, but sends *no message!* The Mormon says he sends messengers, and gives to each a message to be delivered. There is no doubt in my mind but that they are *all* lying prophets, and prophesying falsely. But I have done.

A. P. J.

Buffalo, July 12, 1839.

COMMUNICATION FROM SARAH H. C. GARDINER.

BUFFALO, N. Y., June 20, 1839.

Brother Campbell—

As you have often requested, through the Harbinger, that communications from time to time be made you, concerning the progress of reformation; and as we think it a duty devolving on all faithful brethren so to communicate—and feeling a strong inclination to address brother C., I now take it upon myself to inform you how we are progressing here in Buffalo. Though still few in number, our meetings are continued without interruption, and occasionally a few drop in to hear, and to witness our practice; and I believe that all who do so, with the scriptures in their hands, or hearts either, are constrained to assent, though some very tacitly, through fear of the Baptists, or through parental authority. We have recently become acquainted with a Mr. Havener, about a year since from Ireland, and who has, since residing in this country, been preaching for a Baptist society in the village of Lyons, whilst he has taught a school for his support. On coming to Buffalo circumstances threw him among us, and though strongly prepossessed against us, through Baptist misrepresentation, (so strongly that he assured us he should not have ventured among us had he been aware of it at the time,) he has notwithstanding listened, searched, and examined, until I believe he is ready to advocate with us the principles of reformation: he meets with us, and occasionally takes part in our meetings; and such is invariably the influence of truth on all intelligent and candid Bible students, of all denominations, from whatever country they come. Instances of this kind have a cheering and animating influence upon us—particularly when they come from the Baptist ranks, from which quarter we have been accustomed to receive, in times past, such repeated hostilities.

On the whole, though New York state has hitherto continued to present a sterile aspect to disciples of the New Testament, yet we are not without strong hopes of the ultimate triumph of truth, even here. In Williamsville and Clarence the prospects are very cheering, and we sometimes refresh ourselves by visiting the congregations in that section. We are still disposed to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, and to use our whole influence more or less to promote the good cause. We expect contentions, and from the present state of things around us it cannot be otherwise. The Apostle Paul

found contentions springing up among his Corinthian brethren. Some were of Paul, some of Apollos, some of Cephas, and some of Christ. In those days all that were of Christ would listen to the Apostles who spoke his word with power; and in the present day, the numerous divisions in almost endless variety that distract the people, are susceptible of being hushed to peace by an appeal to his word. But whilst they are saying we are of Calvin, of Luther, or Arminius, and are as tenacious of their creeds as the Pagan world were of their idol-gods, how can they speak the same things, or be one in Christ? When will the professors of the Christian religion cease to follow the doctrines and commandments of men, and with one voice say, We are of Christ, we know in whom we have believed, and his word shall decide all our controversies.

The Union meeting, last week convened at Rochester, brings to our view an interesting crisis. Professing Christians from the various denominations, from all parts of the Union, meeting on the ground of free discussion, is a new and encouraging item in the history of our times, and promises much for the cause of reformation. Brethren Yearnshaw, Jones, and Clarke, who attended, with some of our Rochester friends, are much elated with the meeting, and their anticipations concerning its probable future results. I hope that the Unionists may not take fright at the position they now occupy, in view, full view, as they must be, of the numerous admissions of error which it involves, and start back, or creep back again into their shells, as I have sometimes known individuals to do, through sensitiveness at the idea of encountering disgrace and unpopularity. For ourselves, we have never felt disposed to do this, and recently I have been not a little surprized from hearing that Elder Tucker, of the Baptist church, had some time ago reported among our friends at Rochester that he had "completely silenced me." This boast of his no doubt conveyed to those to whom it was addressed, the impression that I had ceased to speak or act, (here in Buffalo) in support of the views I so warmly advocated for two years before we left Rochester. On hearing of this language from Elder T., I was reminded of the only interview I had with him after we came to Buffalo. We had taken lodgings with a Mr. Reeve, who had recently left the Presbyterians, and had been baptized by Elder T. with his whole household, consisting of his wife and daughters, (in the whole five individuals,) and on the Lord's day previous to our entering into the family as boarders—this circumstance was mentioned to us by them, and of course led to conversations on the subject of baptism. In the course of the week Elder T. called to see them, and was introduced to me. Mr. Gardiner not being present, he began some inquiries concerning him, having known him at Rochester. I was aware that he was not ignorant of our standing among the Baptists, and I did not expect that he would be very free to converse. On hearing that we had passed the winter in Philadelphia, he asked with what church we had united when in that city? And being informed that we had associated with the Bank street church, under Elder Ballantine, he opened a pretty direct fire of words against brother Alexander Campbell, saying, "that he had known Elder Ballantine—that he was a good man, and formerly highly respected; but that A. C. had poisoned him as well as many others—that he had himself been visiting some southern sec-

tions of the country, where the deplorable effects of Campbellism had made his heart bleed—that whole churches were broken up, and that utter ruin and devastation followed the introduction of A. C.'s pernicious views and doctrines." I attempted to inquire wherein all this ruin could consist; observing that reformation in word and deed, according to the New Testament, being the thing proposed by Mr. Campbell, to the professing Christian community, I could not conceive how it should produce ruin. However, Mr T. was not disposed to hear me, or to allow me to be heard by others. All the answer I received was to the following effect, and delivered in most sonorous sounds, and with violent gesticulations:—"That it was not worth his while to talk with me, or with any such unstable souls; that however rational they might be on other subjects, they were perfectly insane on this." I observed that I thought Mr. C. was not very generally understood, especially on the subject of the Spirit, and asked him if he had read his works, hinting that it would be to his credit as a man of candor, to hear before he ventured to denounce. His answer was, "Yes; and I am not *afraid* to put my *broad hand* on *Alexander Campbell*, and the *cause he advocates*, and on all his *infatuated followers*, and *pronounce them the works of the Devil.*" These I believe were his precise words, and twice repeated in the space of about ten minutes to his astonished auditors. This anathema had its intended effect of course on the family for whose particular benefit it was given; and it certainly had an effect upon me. I was astonished beyond measure at the authority of the *man of sin*, that could so decidedly manifest himself and exalt himself above all that is written; for so it appeared to me. But I had no chance of reply; for the *reverend* gentleman most majestically arose from his seat, and added, "I now warn all this family not to converse with this infatuated woman, nor to hear her in any of these things, for utter ruin is the consequence." He then left the room without the civilities of a "good night," followed by the whole family, who attended him to his home for the further benefit of his fatherly counsel—all but the old lady, who returned to the room after he left the house. With this family we staid a week after this; but I was invariably left alone if I attempted to open a conversation on the subject above named, and was told by the old gentleman that they had resolved, one and all, that these things should not be introduced. I must confess that in the *then* state of my nerves, suffering as I was under extreme debility, the effects of Elder T.'s violence and harshness was, for the time, rather unhappy. I felt that it was the height of clerical power poured on my defenceless head; and had he possessed the power of the Roman Pontiff, having the tortures of the Inquisition at his command, I must have experienced the penalties of heresy as expounded by the Holy Mother Church. In Rochester we had encountered the chilling coldness of brethren, once our warm friends, and who dared scarcely exchange with us passing civilities, being warned by Dr. Cumstock (then Pastor of the Baptist church there) that our heresy was not only damning, but very contagious; yet such was the courteousness of the Doctor's character, that he could never find it in his heart to treat me with violent language: the most he could do was to evade my questions if proposed with earnestness, keep out of my way if possible, and to warn his lambs of my wickedness. Indeed, I could never get but one hearing from the Doctor. He had

exhorted his congregation to be learners of the New Testament; and one day calling to see us, I took occasion to ask him if he thought the New Testament a revelation from God to man, and to be understood according to the import of the language. He answered, "Yes," without hesitation; and the next question was, Why do not you and others preach it according to its literal import? His reply was, that he did. O no, (said I,) Doctor, neither your preaching nor any other that I ever heard, is at all to the same effect: for instance, the commission of the Lord Jesus to his Apostles when he sent them into all the world, reads, (Matth. xvi. 16., "Go preach," &c. "He that believes and is baptized shall be saved." "Oh!" said the Doctor, "I think that the word *baptize* in that passage is figurative." I observed that the word *baptize* was coupled with another word, and why are they not both figurative! and if figurative, what are they figurative of! "Oh!" said the Doctor, (with a sigh,) "I lament that you have got to *cavilling*, *criticising*, and *harping* on those nice distinctions that have involved all the world in disputes for centuries. Why, the very notion that baptism is essential to salvation, has introduced infant sprinkling, and a great many errors that you and I deplore. If you continue in this course you will lose all spirituality, and I warn you to desist; but I have not time at present, neither talents nor inclination for controversy." So saying, the Doctor hurried away, nor could I ever after get him to converse on a sentence of the New Testament. But excuse me, brother C. I have been led into giving you the above little sketch of clerical dealings with regard to myself, from hearing of this noble boast of Elder T's. Had I heard of it, at the time you were in Buffalo, it would have prompted me to urge the gentleman to attack Mr. C. himself, and not to spend his strength on female weakness and defencelessness, and then to make his boast of a victory he never achieved. For my part, I should think I was *silenced*, had I been heard and answered with scripture proof showing my errors; but when I hinted that it was his duty to point out our errors, and endeavor to reclaim us as brethren, I received only reproach and contempt. I suppose that the Rev. gentlemen was acting under his wily brother Power's smooth policy, when he sat so quietly in the Baptist house in Buffalo, and heard you advocate that, which had he believed his own words, was advocating the "works of the Devil." It is highly probable that he accompanied brother Power in his southern tour, and so fully imbibed the same spirit, from the things he saw and heard, things so confounding to all clerical dignity, that he resolved henceforth "to fight Campbellism by letting it alone"—except in cases like mine, when he might expect to "kill two birds with one stone"—i. e. frighten into silence a half dozen others, still weaker than the one attacked. In such cases it will, I suppose, be deemed lawful to vary from the rule. It costs nothing, and leaves him safe to boast of conquests never won. Most admirable policy *that* of Elder Power's, and most convenient for such brave Generals as Elder Tucker to use among men, and never to be violated but on special occasions, when a brave soldier ought to show his bravery—that is, among women. But I suppose I am relating nothing new to you, instances of the same kind have doubtless come before you; and Elder Tucker did not happen to be the first of his kind that I met with. During the time of a Baptist Association, in Rochester, when we had been represented as sowing the seeds of discord

among the brethren by introducing scripture questions, certain Baptist clergymen, who, like Elder Tucker, took special care not to come in contact with Mr. Gardiner, were not a little solicitous to open their battery upon me. Visiting by request a certain neighbor, I found six strangers present, all I believe Baptist ministers, who kindly undertook my case. I found that I stood pretty fairly committed by these neighbors, they having confessed that the questions agitated by Mr. G. and myself had brought them to halting and doubting, so that they had lost their former confidence in themselves, in their brethren, and in the doctrines taught by the Baptists; that they no longer enjoyed themselves as formerly, and had lost all spirit of prayer. On the strength of this confession they were exhorted and warned from all quarters, and special prayers were instituted by the church for their restoration to Baptist peace and security; and when these worthies set the battle in array against me, it was for the purpose of breaking me down in the presence of this family, that all discussions might be stopped for the future. Our argument, (if so it may be called,) commenced on the new-measure system of conversion, brought into fashion by Messrs. Finney and Burchard, and which our Baptist friends had been trying to carry out. I was aware that my presence had been anticipated by most of the company, and therefore led the way to the desired conversation, by saying I was surprized to see our Baptist friends so carried away by the new measures; things that we had no precedent for in the New Testament, and appealed to those present to say if they could find any thing in the Acts of Apostles, that would bear any resemblance to the scenes that we had seen got up in the different churches in Rochester for the few weeks past? This brought questions and remarks from about half a dozen mouths at once. One asked for my grounds of objection; another desired to know what better measures I could devise for the salvation of sinners; another, taking his cue from this, supposed that the lady thought herself more competent than all the ministers put together; another wondered how any one could have a heart to throw cold water on a zeal that was accomplishing so much good around us. I endeavored to shape my answer to meet all that came to my ear; and observed, that we had no right to suppose, at this day of the world, that it was left for us, in *our wisdom*, to devise means for the conversion of the world; that the gospel was sent into all the world eighteen hundred years ago; and if the same gospel was now preached, the world might be converted; but that our new converts must all be converted over again, or they could not be saved. Some of these were present. Elder Cole, who seemed determined to lead in the attack, (because he probably had heard some of my remarks on a sermon he had delivered,) here said, "I suppose, madam, that *you hold* that none of us preach the gospel!" Most assuredly I do; and the sermon of this afternoon was any thing but the gospel—a scrap concerning the Pharisee and Publican, made up in shape to deceive the people. Ignorant as they are of the scriptures, they were told that if they would humble themselves as this Publican, that God would receive them. And at the close of the sermon, after much persuasion to induce them to do this, all anxious souls were invited to come forward to the anxious bench to be prayed for; and those who complied supposed they had obeyed the gospel.

Elder Corwen wished me to state how I would have them preach, and what I would call preaching the gospel. I said I would have them preach Christ, and all who believed on him should be exhorted to do as Peter commanded on the day of Pentecost, Acts ii. 38. When I repeated the passage some present seemed shocked and disgusted; some were amused by the novelty, and laughed heartily. Elder Cole reddened with anger, and pronounced it "rank Campbellism," and in the next breath called me "a Campbellite." I parried this, and proceeded to ask why the same things should not be preached, and if there was any thing in the new measures that could compare, in simplicity, beauty, and propriety, with the ancient gospel? "*Ancient gospel!*" repeated Elder Cole—"that is Campbell's favorite name for his new notions." Elder Corwen professed himself ignorant even of the name of A. Campbell, and asked for information. Elder Cole attempted giving your sentiments, or rather his version of them, and I remonstrated. Elder Corwen begged Elder Cole to permit me to explain Mr. C.s new theory. I said I did not understand him to have proposed one, but a return to the primitive gospel; and who could look around Christendom, and not confess that all denominations had more or less departed from it? Elder Cole here supposed I would have all go to Mr. C., and be set right. I replied that, with Mr. Campbell, I would recommend that all should go to the New Testament, and be set right. Elder Cole grew loud, red, and angry—said something about stopping the mouths of silly women that had more brass than sense, and Elders Corwen and Davis were compelled to call him to order for his breach of civility, and from first to last his language and manner were rude in the extreme. He broke in upon me several times when I was attempting to answer questions put by Elder Corwen. The affairs of the tea-table were with difficulty finished. The friends that I was visiting were hurt that I should attempt to stand my ground against the Reverends, and I was branded by the Reverends with the epithets "bold, impudent woman," as I heard afterwards. But I was not then ashamed of the cause I advocated, nor am I now, nor shall I be when the Lord appears. Neither would any impropriety have been attached to a lady for speaking on any other subject in a private circle of her own friends, though strangers might be present. I might have descanted on arts or sciences, on law or politics, in the presence of all the Doctors in the land, without injury to my reputation as a modest lady—nay, I might have descended, though a Christian professor, to all the frivolities of common tea-table chat, or to a participation in a choice dish of scandal, without incurring the disapprobation or rebuke of the clergy: and this I know by experience; for I have always found myself well received and politely treated in good society, from Rhode Island to Richmond, Va., and never incurred censure until I opened my lips on these topics; and since then I have invariably found that a a plain passage of scripture brought to bear on any of their traditions, brought down immediate reproach and contumely, and seemed to be itself the direct cause of fixing their hatred. Assured of this, disciples of the New Testament should put on the whole armor of God, that they may be enabled to stand unflinching and firm in all things that involve the word of the Master; for it is a solemn truth, and ought to be impressed on all our hearts, that those who despise, despise not us, but God; and this consideration has often strengthened and urged

forward one of the weakest and most sensitive of human beings; and I have to confess that this sensitiveness is my most to be deplored infirmity, and has sometimes deterred me from entering into conversations on these subjects; for being in my feelings so acute a sufferer, I have feared for the effects on my health: but I attribute this to more than ordinary female weakness, and cannot for a moment excuse myself in its indulgence. What, then, must we think of a male disciple of our Lord and Master, who is never known to open his lips in the name of Jesus and his despised disciples, and who passes month after month without meeting with the few brethren, who, on Lord's day, meet together to break the loaf of blessing—urging his profession (practice of medicine) and the distance of less than three miles, in excuse for non-attendance, and for his meanness?—I know not how to call it by any other name)—'That he is not gifted with the powers of oratory.' I think I can enter into the feelings of such a one: for supposing him as sensitive as myself, he can say it will be of no use for me to agitate these things among my acquaintance; for not being gifted as an orator, I shall fail to effect them otherwise than to incur their resentment. This will hurt my feelings, and also retard my advancement in the line of my profession, without effecting any thing towards their conversion.—Will such an excuse avail in the great day? or would it be received when any other interest was at stake in society?—say, the securing of elections; for instance, the friends of a cause are expected to use their influence, whether gifted with powers of oratory or not. And is there any thing to excuse a Christian, either male or female, from using their influence in that cause which, according to their profession, should be supposed to interest them most of all? And should that subject which bears the impress of eternity, be the only subject excluded from the social circle? And must the sublime topics of salvation remain an interdicted theme? And whilst the passing news of the day may be discussed, and, whether joyous or grievous, receive its quantum of sympathies, must He who came to save us from this present evil world receive no homage from lips polite? Forbid it, gratitude! and every generous feeling of the human soul forbid that Christians should so shut themselves up! And if our male professors do not set the example, let the females provoke them to speech, lest "the stones should cry out." Timothy's mother Eunice, and grand-mother Lois, are rarely represented in modern society; and those who would venture to represent them in any good degree, are in danger of being excluded for their temerity.

And now, brother Campbell, having written thus much, and more than I intended when I commenced; I would, for various reasons, like that you should give my long epistle a place in your publication. We all know that "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks;" and also that the ready pen, impelled by the fingers, obeys the dictates of the heart. I am willing that all whom it may concern should know what manner of spirit I am of—that I still stand firm and unshaken in the cause of that reformation which it has been your happiness to advocate, and never to be silenced whilst I retain my natural powers, by any such measures as have hitherto been employed to silence me.

I remain, with much respect and esteem, yours, &c.

SARAH H. C. GARDINER.

☞ The preceding communication from our excellent sister GARDINER, for perspicuity, simplicity, and force of style; as well as for the good sense, intelligence, and piety which it displays, commends itself to the perusal of all our female readers; and suggests to them with what evidence, power, and persuasion many of them might commend the good cause to the acceptance of their friends. A. C.

News from the Churches.

Lexington, Kentucky; August 5, 1839.

For several months past our young brethren, Thomas A. Gaines and R. C. Rice, who have recently commenced preaching, and myself, have been preaching almost weekly at a small place about three miles from Lexington, called Saundersville; and would occasionally gather a sheaf as the first fruits of our labors there. About ten days ago our brethren W. Hunter, E. Campbell, T. A. Gaines, and R. Rice, commenced holding night meetings there, it not being convenient for the people to attend preaching in the day time. Under their united labors the harvest, fully ripe, began to fall. A few evenings after they began I thrust in my sickle and reaped with them. We succeeded in gathering altogether about forty sheaves. To drop the figure, thirty-six confessed the Lord for baptism, and four others united—two who had been members of the Baptist church. Circumstances would not permit any of them to be immersed until yesterday, Lord's day. In the afternoon, at 4 o'clock, I preached to a very crowded audience, and succeeded in influencing one young man to step out on the side of the Lord; after which we repaired to a beautiful pond near the house of 'Squire Payne, close at hand, where I immersed thirty-six persons into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

It was altogether one of the most imposing scenes I ever witnessed. The kind 'Squire Payne, who has long been a professor of Christianity, a Baptist, had the goodness to have a bridge constructed over the muddy bank to the very brink of the water, and house prepared for the immersed to dress in. The bank all around was in the form of an amphitheatre, and the space was large enough to accommodate some thousands of persons. But every spot was occupied by carriages and other vehicles, horses, and hundreds on foot—all enabled to witness the immersion. And, for so large a crowd, I never saw better behaviour. A cloud shieled us from the hot sun nearly the whole time. It reminded me of one of John the Baptist's immersions, which I mentioned at the time. I do not think I was more than 15, or, at most, more than 20 minutes, immersing the 36 persons. I stated near the close of the immersion, that the futile and even puerile objection to the immersion of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost, so often urged in support of the dying cause of Pedobaptism, was sufficiently refuted by the fact, that I had immersed as many as any man could, in the usual way, sprinkle in the same length of time.

On next Lord's day I am to constitute a church at Saundersville.

If we only had efficient preachers enough to supply the increasing demand in this state, the whole country would soon be under the influence of the Christian religion. How shall we procure preachers and pastors to take care of the numerous flocks we already have? Cannot you, brother Campbell, suggest a plan; and, what is equally necessary, put the congregations in a way to support them?

B. F. HALL.

The cry for help is universal. Brethren that have truly given themselves away to the Lord, his cause, and people, are kept posting up and down, as field marshals in the heat of battle, until their energies are gone in a few years. Churches are not set in order. Evangelists convert, but do not generally set things in order. Helps in the church, shepherds over the flocks, under the Chief Shepherd, as well as evangelists, are wanting. The people pray for laborers in the vineyard. But it seems to me they must still farther be awakened; and their wants and that of the cause must be still more deeply felt; their souls must be farther liberalized, and heavenly things must more effectually eclipse the earthly, before the work of the Lord will advance as it ought to do. The cardinal, sublime, and omnipotent conceptions we have obtained on the whole subject of Christ's gospel, had we now a sufficient number of evangelists of the right stamp, would as certainly sweep the whole land of sectarianism from North to South, from East to West, as the waters descend the Ohio. But there is scarcely a man among us can appreciate the value of the views of the Christian institution which Heaven has vouchsafed to us; nor is there one of us sufficiently penetrated with a feeling of our own responsibility. O, Eternity! Eternity! The resurrection of the just! Everlasting life! Heaven with all its hosts of light, and life, and love! When shall these themes fill our souls and fire our hearts with equal energies and efforts. We must soon touch these themes in a new style. I wait for a moment's rest. The fire burns: it will break forth. We want a thousand evangelists—all saints—sober, grave, pious, benevolent, athletic men in the Lord. We want schools for prophets—for teachers—for the training of an efficient army of the faith. In one word, we want churches like golden candlesticks, all over the land; and stars, angels, going to and fro in all the land, subduing the enemies, and enlisting new troops against the world, the flesh, and Satan. Depend upon it, brother Hall, and all the brethren who are deeply in earnest in this great matter, I will go with my whole heart into all the evangelical machinery and operations for the purification of the church, the perfecting the saints, and the salvation of the world.

A. C.

Louisville, Ky., August 6, 1839.

It is good to be cheered while passing through this wilderness, with an occasional shout of victory and the retreat of the enemy. The Lord be praised for the success of his cause and word at Harrod's creek, in Oldham county, 18 miles above this place, the field of our beloved brother Allen's labors during his lifetime. On the Saturday previous to the 3d Lord's day in July, brethren Morton, Pinkerton, and myself, commenced a protracted meeting at Harrod's creek; during the progress of which, brother Marshall, from Scott, and brother Helm, from Flat Rock, united with us. We dined each day on the ground, from the abundant supply furnished by the brethren, who nobly acted

their part. I could only remain four days, having previous engagements at Cincinnati; during which time sixty, of all ages, from 12 up, obeyed the word, and were reclaimed from the world. The meeting was continued for some ten days more at that place, and Flat Rock, about 6 miles distant, by brethren Morton, Pinkerton, and Helm. The final result was, as I this day learned, 150 or 160 were added to the church at Harrod's creek, and about 50 at Flat Rock, making the round number of 200 or 210.

"Glorious things of thee are spoken,
Zion, city of our God."

In the number of 150 at Harrod's creek I judge there were some 30 or more who returned to the church, after having remained out since the division of the Baptist church some years since. The happy effects of their return will be greatly felt.

I rejoice to be able to say to our brethren abroad, that the church at this place have greatly improved in its condition during the last year past, previous to which time our troubles were many and grievous; but we thank the Lord that for ten months past there has not been the first case of difficulty: and there has been added to our number about ninety by confession and letter. We look forward to better times, and we trust that the day is not far distant when the light of truth will spread over our city.

Since last November there has been added to the churches of Louisville, Jeffersontown, Chinoweth's Run, Flat Rock, and Harrod's Creek, in some 18 miles around here, about 340; at New Albany, Jeffersonville, and Charleston, Ia., say from 5 to 15 miles from us, about 160—total, 500.

We say to our fellow-laborers, Come and see us; we will receive you cordially. The Lord bless all who love him.

G. W. ELLEY.

Boone county, Missouri, July 19, 1839.

We have just closed a three days' meeting at Bear Creek, in this county. Four confessed the Saviour in order to obedience. Brothers Wills, Lee, and myself were the teachers. A few days before I immersed one other.

The churches of Christ, in the counties of Callaway, Boon, Howard, Randolph, Monroe, and Cole, will hold an annual meeting at Fulton, to commence on Friday before the 2d Lord's day in October next. It is expected that each church will make a communication, and state when they were constituted, and with how many members, and what the present number, &c.—our object being to obtain and give correct information upon this subject. T. M. ALLEN.

Stanford, Lincoln county, Kentucky, August 6, 1839.

It is matter of much joy that the cause of Immanuel prospers. During last spring and this summer I have seen the cause of truth exceedingly triumphant over the breadth of Kentucky, from Monticello to Covington. At Williamstown, Grant county, during two visits, one in March and one in July last, I obtained an accession of twenty-two to the church. At Monticello, in June last, in company with brother John Smith, thirty were won over to the side of primitive Christianity; six of whom had been Methodists: but on hearing for

themselves, and finding us misrepresented and persecuted, honored the truth as it is in Jesus. At Nicholasville, in company with brother Gano, we were instrumental in increasing the church by an addition of twenty, in June last. During last month, at the Cave Spring meeting-house, in company with brother John T. Johnson and others, ere I left thirty-five bowed to the sceptre of the Prince of Peace. On the Hanging Fork, with Jacob Creath, sen., and T. and C. Smith, during the first two weeks of last month, we had an accession of 23 among three churches; to one of which, Euen's Meeting-House, I had an accession of two more two days ago. Does this not look like bringing back primitive success by primitive Christianity?

Of late I have thought of visiting my native country, (Scotland,) and fighting under the banner of the Cross awhile among my kinsfolk and the inhabitants of the region of my nativity. Don't you intend to visit Scotland? If you do, I would like, should it be convenient, to be in your company.* WILLIAM BEGG.

Carthage, Ohio, August 1, 1839.

The cause of Christ is advancing slowly in this vicinity. I have immersed 22 at White Oak, recently. Brother Rice and I were at Mount Pleasant on last Lord's day, and had the happiness to see one, and the first in that village, obey the Son of God. The people are attentive, and I think if we are so, that much good may be done in the name of the Lord. We have appointed a protracted meeting in the place, and intend, the Lord willing, to carry on the matter until we shall be convinced that something or nothing can be done.

LOVE H. JAMESON.

Washington, Ill., Tazewell County, July 22, 1839.

At a meeting held with the Walnut Grove Church, Tazewell county, Ill., in the month of June, there were six confessed the Lord Jesus, and were immersed. The church is in peace and doing very well. Brother William Davenport is their regular proclaimer. On the following Lord's day we received one more in the town of Washington.

S. P. GORIN.

Adams County, Illinois, July 1, 1839.

Though a stranger to you in person, I take the liberty to address you with a few lines, in order to give you some account of the prosperity of the good cause of our common Lord in this region. I have been laboring as an evangelist for some time past, and to some extent my labor has been blest. During the last winter I labored constantly in Warren county, and some little in Knox; during which time there were between fifty and sixty persons immersed into Christ. In the county of Warren there are six congregations, and probably three hundred members, or nearly that number. I have been laboring with brother John Rigdon, who is engaged as an evangelist in the counties of Adams, Brown, and Pike. In eight days past there have been forty persons immersed, and some joining by letter, gave an addition of fifty. All these were added to the congregation on Bear Creek, Adams county. The brethren here number upwards of one hundred, and are living together in love. Prospects for future success are cheering. May the good Lord bless the labors of his servants every where, and may they be crowned with success. LIVY HATCHITT.

* I have it in contemplation, but know not how or when I can accomplish it.—A. C.

Cobourg, Upper Canada, July 2, 1830.

As my limits will not allow of lengthened details, I will give you a brief history of the church in this place. Some five or six years ago two of us, brother J. Ford and myself, by various means succeeded in persuading some to believe and obey the gospel of Christ. After a time we were thrown on the back ground by imprudent preachers. They were sincere, and no doubt their motives were good; but they did not observe the example of old brother Paul in becoming all things to all men that they might gain some. However, we revived again, and others were induced to obedience, some from the sects and some from the world. We then became organized and commenced attending the institutions of God's house. During all this time we were most bitterly slandered, and our little flock was a pulpit theme for all the sects: and ever since we commenced operations here it has been with great difficulty the Priests have kept their converts out of the water. About this time I had the great satisfaction of immersing four very worthy and intelligent gentlemen in Port Hope, seven miles from this: one of them had been fitted for a Presbyterian minister in Scotland. They became organized in that place; and although they have had no increase, they attend to the ordinances according to ancient custom. Soon after this (about two years ago) a preacher called on us from Pennsylvania, by the name of E. S. Hubbel, and preached a few discourses, to very good satisfaction, and then departed. Some time after he returned, and the brethren here and at Port Hope thought best to engage him for a time; (I, however, was not anxious, knowing some of his *private* views.) He preached very well a few times, and then began to let out those views to the annoyance of almost every one who heard him. I was very much disgusted with him; consequently conversed freely with him on the subject; but all to no purpose. At last we paid him up and sent him away. It may be necessary to say what his views or opinions were:—1st. There will be no resurrection of any human beings but those who have heard the gospel: consequently, (as he frankly owned to me,) all infants, idiots, and unenlightened heathens are mere brutes, or no better; and that it is no more harm to kill any one of these than any brute beast. 2. That there is no devil, nor never was, save some great ruler or monarch on earth; and he concluded that he is now confined to the person of the Emperor of China, &c. &c, This has thrown us on the back ground again; for all his views were ascribed to us.* But we still hold fast and maintain our cause in despite of all. One year ago we numbered 22: since then some have moved away, some two or three set aside, &c., and we now number 12; and as for intelligence, piety, and virtue, we are at least in good standing with our neighbors. Our courage is the more increased since the 22d of June, being Lord's day, I had the pleasure of introducing three very worthy disciples into the kingdom by immersion. We are sure, by a steady straight-forward course, and living lives devoted to God daily, that we shall yet triumph over opposition.

JOSEPH ASH.

* I have known this Mr. Hubbell for some years. He frequently meets with the brethren; but is not in good standing with any of them, so far as known to me. He is speculative, whimsical, erratic—love-sick withal—and as dogmatical, as seven men who can render seven good reasons I know of no immorality laid to his charge. He was educated, I think, at the Baptist Hamilton School; but his mind has lost the balance-wheel in some way, and he ought not to be regarded as one of us; for he does not believe that Christ died *for our sins*, and redeemed us *by his blood*—at least he did not when last I saw him in Ohio. A. C.

ITEMS.

Some person has sent me from page 145 to the end of a popular debate on Universalism. Would the donor please send me from the beginning to page 145, and thus allow me to see both the beginning and the ending of said popular debate? A. C.

Mr. Gross, editor, or publisher, or printer of the *Evangelical Magazine and Gospel Advocate*, formerly edited by Mr. Skinner, thought it devolved on him, after his friend Skinner had done his best, to follow up my last letter by some two or three columns of *brevier*. He thought it safest for his readers to have my epistle preceded by Skinner, and succeeded by himself. He had better write a supplement for every other letter of his Reverend "Boss" I will promise him impunity so far as I am concerned: for it would take at least twenty of his best epistles to provoke one sentence from me. A. C.

New Publication.—'*The Christian*," a monthly periodical, devoted to the restoration of primitive Christianity—St. Johns, New Brunswick—edited by our intelligent and excellent brother *W. W Eaton*, formerly of Eastport, Maine—at one dollar per annum, in advance. Brother Eaton requests all pamphlets and communications for him from the United States, to be directed to Eastport, Maine; from all other places to St. Johns, New Brunswick.

I have seen two numbers of this work It is very neatly executed. Some articles from the Christian Baptist, Millennial Harbinger, and other works, appear in these numbers, together with some excellent remarks from the Editor. It promises fair to be a useful auxiliary in the good cause in the British provinces. May the Lord bless the labors of our brethren under that government, both in the mother country, and in her North American colonies! A. C.

A piece of a book, from page 41 to 100 inclusive, written against the Book of God, by an old acquaintance, Mr. Olmstead, of Louisville, Ky , has found its way to this office. If I had the whole of it I would read it to know whether its author has any thing new to say against the Book which has done more for human nature—conferred more honor on its origin—shed more glory on its destiny under Christ, than all the books of all languages, all nations, and all ages of the world. What a pity that men get so enraged at the sun, as to sleep all day, and at night dispute with the owls about the glimmerings of the stars! If the author or any one else will send us the book complete, we will try and read it A. C.

Sins of Omission and Commission.—I confess a sin of commission: I said in my Incidents on a Tour to the South, I broke the loaf with the brethren that met in Church street, instead of High street, Lexington, Ky.; and in noticing the happy reconciliation of the difficulties in Lexington church, I omitted that much is due to the indefatigable exertions of brother B. A. Hicks; than whom no person labored more to effect this good object. A. C.

QUERY FROM T. J. MATTHEWS.

"Should a brother be retained in the church who keeps a tippling house, or deals in ardent spirits?"

There are two questions in one. The keeper of a tippling-house, properly so called, is wholly unfit for a place in the kingdom of God, either on earth or in heaven And while I would not say that he who deals at all in ardent spirits is an unworthy professor, some there are who, because of their manner of dealing in such articles, are just as unfit for heaven as he that directly lives upon the tippling sins of the very *canaille* of all society.—Such, at least, is my *opinion*. A. C.

☞ All the queries on file are in store for another number. My other duties forbid my answering them at this moment.

OBITUARY.

From the pen of our beloved brother Butler, of Alabama I have just heard of the death of his excellent mother-in-law—a real mother in Israel. The mournful intelligence is communicated as follows:—

"Of congestive fever, on the 23d July, when returning from the springs, near Montgomery, departed this life, in the consolations of Christ's gospel, Mrs. SUSAN DUCKWORTH, for 30 years a member of the Baptist church."

I formed a very pleasing, and, for the time, an intimate acquaintance with this excellent lady. She loved the Bible, and delighted in the gospel which it announces. Her faith was strong—her conceptions of the truth clear. She thought for herself; and, of course, was not a sectarian in her feelings Her heart was in the work of reformation. May her excellent example be a blessing to all her children! A. C.

Brother ELISHA L. FRAZIER, one of the Bishops of Liberty church, Shelby county, Ky., after a life of activity in the Christian faith, on the 6th of June last, cheerfully resigned up his spirit in the full assurance of a happy resurrection. He has left a widow and five children to follow him to the land of rest.

[*Communicated by his co-Bishop.*]

C. J. N. WHITTLESEY AND J. H. CARLIN

Propose publishing a weekly Journal, in the town of M'Lemoresville, Carroll county, Tenn., to be entitled, THE UNIVERSAL PHILANTHROPIST, AND BEACON OF TRUTH.

In presenting ourselves before the public, in the attitude of publishers of a weekly Journal, custom, as well as an abiding sense of obligation to our patrons, renders it incumbent upon the part of the Editors to make a brief statement of the course they intend to pursue in the editorial arrangement. In doing this, however, we deem it unnecessary to enter into an elaborate discussion.

The Beacon of Truth will advocate no particular sectarian doctrine; but will ever defend, with uncompromising zeal, the principles of primitive Christianity. A small portion of it, however, will be devoted to the interests of the agriculturists—to science—to moral virtue, and the whole to the best interest of mankind. We deem it superfluous to add any more, as we will enter at full length into an explanation of our principles in the first number of our paper.

TERMS:—The Universal Philanthropist and Beacon of Truth will be issued weekly on an imperial sheet, at $3,00 per annum, in advance; $3,50 within six months; or $4,00 within the year. No paper to be discontinued until all arrearages are paid, except at the option of the Editors.

N. B. All letters sent to the Editors on business must be invariably post-paid, otherwise they will not receive attention. Post-Masters and other persons to whom this prospectus may be sent, will please act as agents. Any person procuring five subscribers, and forwarding their subscription to us, will be entitled to one copy for one year, *gratis*.

M'Lemoresville, June 19th, 1839.

☞ Subscriptions received at this Office.

WHAT A SERMON SHOULD BE.

BY JOSHUA MARSDEN.

It should be brief: if lengthy it will steep
Our hearts in apathy, our eyes in sleep;
The dull will yawn, the chapel lounger doze,
Attention flag, and memory's portals close.

It should be warm; a living altar coal,
To melt the icy heart and charm the soul:
A sapless, dull harangue, however read,
Will never rouse the soul, or raise the dead.

It should be simple, practical, and clear;
No time spun theory to please the ear;
No curious lay to tickle letter'd pride,
And leave the poor and plain unedified.

It should be tender and affectionate,
As his warm theme who wept lost Salem's fate;
The fiery law with words of love allay'd,
Will sweetly warn and awfully persuade.

It should be manly, just, and rational,
Wisely conceiv'd, and well express'd within;
Not stuff'd with silly notions, apt to stain
A sacred desk, and show a muddy brain.

It should possess a well adapted grace,
To situation, audience, time, and place;
A sermon form'd for scholars, statesmen, lords,
With peasants and mechanics ill accords.

It should with evangelic beauties bloom,
Like Paul's at Corinth, Athens, or at Rome:
While some Epictetus or Sterne esteem,
A bleeding Jesus is the gospel theme!

It should be mix'd with many an ardent prayer,
To reach the heart, and fix and fasten there;
When God and man are mutually address'd,
God grants a blessing, man is truly blest.

It should be closely, well applied at last,
To make the moral nail securely fast:
Thou art the man, and thou alone, will make
A Felix tremble, and a David quake!

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME III.——NUMBER X.

BETHANY, VA. *OCTOBER*, 1839.

THE GOSPEL—*No. V.*

"Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the GOSPEL which I preached unto you, which also you have received, and wherein ye stand: by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, *how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures.*" 1 COR. XV. 1—4.

WHEN the Sybil offered her books to the king of Rome, and he refused to give the price required, she destroyed a part of them, and returned, demanding the full price for the remainder. What was only pretence in respect to the oracles of the Sybil, is really true of the revelations of God, which are so far above all price, that no value could be placed upon the whole of them which would not be as much possessed by every part. Nevertheless it may be boldly affirmed of that particular portion which contains the history and evidences of Christ's death, burial, and resurrection; that here, as in a focus, is concentrated every thing which gives light, beauty, meaning, or value to the whole.

Among the causes, indeed, which have contributed to produce the present confused state of the Christian profession, there has not been one more efficient than the sentiment that the whole Bible is a doctrinal treatise upon Christianity; and that the gospel is so equally diffused throughout the whole, like the blood in the human system, which may be made to flow from every part, that it may be found indifferently any where from Genesis to Revelation, and equally in the prophecies of Balaam, or the song of Solomon, as in the testimony of Matthew Levi or the Acts of Apostles. This view of the scriptures places the mind at once upon the wide ocean, careless by what gale or to what country it may be driven. Where every fact or incident is regarded as equally important, all become at the same time alike uninteresting; where there

is no distinction, there can be no arrangement; where there is no beginning, there can be no conclusion. As well might a person suppose that light is universally diffused throughout nature, and that he could possess himself of it by putting into his pocket the shining pebbles by which it is reflected. To direct his attention to the sun as the true source of light, would not sooner interrupt the labors of such a virtuoso, than would the proper exhibition of the simple facts of the gospel give a new turn to the investigations of the modern Bible student.

That all scripture given by inspiration is profitable for the various purposes for which its different parts are designed, and that it is all necessary to the perfection of the godly man, is cheerfully admitted. But what we would insist upon is this: that it is with the gospel facts we have first and chiefly to do; that it is by these we are first met on the part of Heaven; and that these not only comprise all that is necessary, so far as the Christian faith, and the salvation of the sinner is concerned, but involve necessarily and immediately the consideration of all preceding and succeeding revelations. Like the rich clusters of the vine in which the new wine is found, there is a blessing in them; and like these same clusters also, which are both the first in design and the last in production, the gospel facts (Christ and him crucified) are the first and the last, the Alpha and the Omega of revelation. In short, there is not a principle of action, or an exhortation to duty; a hope or a privilege; an institution or a doctrine in Christianity, which is not deducible from these simple facts, as the oak is evolved from the acorn, or the leaf unfolded from the bud. We would not be understood to say, however, that human reason could have made these deductions, any more than that human power could bring an oak out of an acorn. Christianity is as much beyond the reason of man, as the works of nature are beyond his power. The eyes of Reason could not even perceive its existence, unless it were revealed by the light of faith, and unfolded in its maturity by the efficient influences of a divine agency. Yet it is no sooner thus presented, than reason at once perceives the absolute and necessary connexion which subsists between its different parts; the relations of principles and laws; of facts and results; of means and ends; and is enabled to trace the steps of that inductive process by which the whole has been elaborated from a single germ.

We have spoken in our last essay of the simplicity of the gospel as a means of salvation, and endeavored to show that this simplicity is not only an evidence of its divine origin and perfection, and in accordance with the economy of nature; but that the gospel is by this means adapted to the capacity and understanding of those to whom it is addressed—human beings indiscriminately, rich and poor; high and low;

earned and illiterate. We have now to show that the gospel facts, with all their simplicity, are pre-eminently adapted to arrest and interest the attention of all, and that they are precisely suited to the wants and circumstances of the human family.

When the Apostle Peter first stood up, with the eleven, to announce the gospel to the Jews, his heart failed not and his voice faltered not, from any forebodings that the news he bore would prove either uninteresting or unsuited to his audience. On the contrary, he felt nerved with the conviction that the simple tale he had to tell would cause the ears of all to tingle, and their hearts to bleed. And the event justified his confidence; yet, after all, the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ were the themes on which he dwelt. Now, again, when directed by the Spirit to the house of the first Gentile converts, whose minds were filled with the highest expectations which a celestial visitant could excite, did he draw upon imagination for unheard of marvels, or upon reflection for cogent and ingenious reasoning. He could think of nothing better suited to the momentous occasion, than an unadorned detail of the facts in Christ's history, which not only proved adequate to the salvation of the hearers, but had power to bring down miracles from heaven.

The first declaration of the gospel is, that "Christ died for our sins." The question immediately occurs, Who is Christ? Being informed that he is the Son of God, the querist, if an idolator, again inquires, And who is God? And no sooner is he taught that God created the heavens and the earth, and that this glorious Being has deputed his only begotten Son as a messenger to the human race, than his mind is overwhelmed with the illustrious character of the messenger and the mission. Ear cannot hear, nor can it enter into the imagination to conceive of any annunciation which could be made to man so well calculated as this to seize upon his attention and enchain his soul. The honor conferred by an embassage from heaven to earth, from the King eternal, immortal, and invisible to poor transitory mortals, is itself transcendant; and when this is enhanced by the noble lineage and lofty character of the envoy, and the peculiar nature and dignity of the offices he fills, it becomes overwhelming to every one who has a mind to understand or a heart to feel.

But it is said that this illustrious person "died for our sins." And who would not be interested here? Death is a word of awful and peculiar meaning to all. Sin is a term of deep significance to the whole race of Adam. Every one feels himself touched here, and perceives the direct and immediate relation which the first fact of the gospel bears to himself and to all mankind, death having passed upon all men, for

that all have sinned. It is a revelation calculated to interest not merely the poor, but the wealthy; not merely the peasant, but the prince. It has no peculiar adaptation to any particular individual, to any single city, district, or country; but is alike interesting and important to all.

The same may be said of the other facts of the gospel. Interested in death, we are interested in the habitations of the dead—our future abode. When we are informed that one of such glorious origin was buried, our thoughts wander around his tomb, and we are curious to know the event. How deeply affecting, then, becomes the joyful annunciation that Christ is risen from the dead! There cannot be anything conceived of such absorbing interest to the human race as a fact like this. A resurrection from the grave! How strange! How joyful! How glorious! There lives not the human being who would not be startled at the first announcement of an occurrence so wonderful in itself, and so intimately connected with the highest hopes and the greatest fears of man.

It is apparent, then, that the facts of the gospel, notwithstanding their extreme simplicity, are precisely of such a nature as to touch the human family where they feel most acutely; and that they are preeminently calculated to arrest the attention of the whole race of Adam, so that the missionary from civilized Europe who bears the message to the distant islands of the ocean, is conscious that he is possessed of tidings which will interest the uneducated savage of Autralasia as much as it has the cultivated inhabitants of his native land.

R. R.

SCEPTICISM.

LETTERS TO B——, A SCEPTIC—*No. VIII.*

ALLEGHENNY CITY, September 9th, 1839.

My dear Friend,

BUT to return to the ancients: when I think of those *great* men, (and perhaps, for the times they lived, *good* men,) I am led to exclaim with the Psalmist, "Who can understand his errors?" that is, without divine illumination; as the benighted wanderer might exclaim, "How shall I find my way without some friendly lamp to guide me?" In religion they themselves felt a painful lack—a fearful uncertainty. As Alcibiades was going one day to the temple to pray, Socrates met him; and on being told his object, he said to him, "You ought to wait till it shall please the gods to make a revelation to you instructing you how to worship them acceptably." But in morals they probably thought themselves perfect; yet they esteemed nothing *immoral* that

did not do *violence* to either the *person* or *property* of their neighbor. Historians have given the characters of these men much as they have done the scenes of the *battle-field;* in describing which they seek to keep the mind of the reader upon "the *prowess* of the soldiers," "the *skill* and *bravery* of the General," "the *soul-stirring* clangor of martial music," and "the *splendors* of the victory;" well knowing that, were they faithfully to go into the heart-sickening details of "the heaps of the slain," "the mangled corpses," "the rivers of gore," "the anguish of the wounded," "the groans of the dying:" and the grief for "the slain in battle," "the father's sorrow," "the mother's lamentation," "the widow's wail," "the orphan's tears"—I say, did they faithfully describe all this, there would be few admirers of the *science of killing men!!!* Thus in describing the characters of the ancients the historians have given the *brilliant* spots in their characters, and have concealed the *disgusting* details.

Few historians, in giving the history of Socrates, have told us that "he was a Sodomite," and that "he prostituted his wife for gain:" few also have told us, when describing the philosophical composure with which he discoursed upon death, in the presence of a large circle of friends, that, in his solitude, he used often to exclaim, "O death! thou terrible thing!—thou most terrible of all things!!"* Few historians have told us that the admired Epictetus was a Sodomite, and that the renowned Seneca instigated Nero to *murder his mother;* that an eminent philosopher when asked, "What could best enable a man to bear misfortunes?" replied, "To see your enemies in a worse condition;" or that the refined Cicero was most revengeful, and said, "Revenge is sweet!" But all know that the admired Cato was a *suicide!!*

Although these things have been mostly concealed, yet the page of authentic antiquity, when fully searched, I believe as fully declares them as any other facts concerning these men. But if you leave these *individuals*, and go to the *nations* to which they belonged, what shall we behold? Survey the Pantheon of Greece and Rome!—their *human sacrifices*—their cruel and bloody rites—their obscene ceremonies—their stupid adoration: then count their forty thousand Deities, and tell me what you think of "the light of Nature"—of "the lamp of Reason."

If you are wearied and *disgusted* with this *survey*, you may seek relief in a survey of the oriental world in modern times; where the nations, in the plenitude of their *wisdom* and *superior light*, drove Christianity from their dominions by the irresistible arguments of the sword and the spear! Go to the temple of Juggernaut: behold its nameless pollutions—its horrid cruelties! witness the thousands crushed to death under the wheels of its ponderous car! behold the whitened bones of its wretched victims strewing the highways in every direction for fifty miles around, who perished from want and starvation! behold the widow ascending the funeral pile of her husband! behold the wretched victims suspended from the branches of trees by ropes and

* Thus in modern times David Hume, in the presence of company, was quite merry, even to the very last, making sport of death, and jesting about "Charon's boat;" but when alone with his nurse he appeared so horrified, that, as she said, she could scarcely bear to stay in the room with him. His gaiety was, then, as one has said, merely "whistling aloud to keep his courage up."

hooks in their flesh, for hours beneath a vertical sun, to appease the anger of their deities! behold infant innocence and infirm old age cast out upon the banks of the river to perish beneath a burning sun, or be devoured by beasts of prey! If you cannot look upon these scenes, go to the temple of the *learned* and philosophic Brahmin, and behold his *stupid worship;* or go to his *harem*, and glance at his pride, his cruelty, and lust. If you turn away from all these idolatrous scenes in loathing and abhorrence, come back to the nations where idolatry has been abolished in seas of blood! Behold the Priest of Mahomet setting forth the doctrines and pretensions of that Prophet at all times with a drawn sword in his hand, a perpetual memorial of the manner in which his religion was first propagated! Hear him setting forth his "Elysium of bliss"—his heaven of *beastly sensuality!!* Nay, do not frown upon me for leading you to these scenes. I know your heart will sicken; but these men are all guided by *reason*—that is, *their reason*. You will not imitate the example of the Brahmin, who, on being presented with a microscope that disclosed to him the *realities* of things, and showed him that his daily food was teeming with living creatures, in a rage seized a stone and crushed the microscope to atoms. The picture is a startling one, but it is *true to the life*.

But if you insist that these are barbarous and unrefined people, (though surely the Brahmins are proverbial for wisdom and learning,) I will allow you to come to the most enlightened times and the most enlightened nations of Europe; and thence select the very *Apostles of Reason—alias* infidelity. If we may credit their own countrymen and cotemporaries, the matter stands thus:—"Blount committed suicide, because he was prevented an *incestuous marriage*"—"Bolingbroke was a rake, and a flagitious politician"—"Collins and Shaftsbury qualified themselves for civil offices by partaking of the sacrament, (a solemn expression of belief in Christ,) while at the same time they were preparing a work against the Christian religion"—"Morgan continued to profess the Christian religion while writing against it." "Hume was proud, revengeful, disgustingly vain, and a public advocate of *suicide and adultery*"—"Voltaire was a *lewd* and profane blasphemer"—"Paine was the slave of the most low and debasing habits"—and Rousseau—yes the *refined and eloquent* Rousseau, who wrote such a sublime eulogy on the New Testament; this same Rousseau was "an abandoned sensualist, guilty of the basest actions, which he sometimes confessed and attempted to palliate."—But you are wearied and *disgusted* with this picture; and so am I. Tell me, then, what you think of the light of *nature* and *reason!*

These men themselves despised their own systems: they saw their ruinous tendencies. Dr. Beattie once proposed this question categorically to David Hume: "If you had a wife and daughters, would you wish them to embrace your sentiments?" And he added, "Reflect on what you are going to say; for whatever your answer is, I will *not* conceal it." Mr. Hume replied with a smile, "No: I confess that scepticism is too sturdy a virtue for woman."

When some of Voltaire's friends visited him on a certain occasion, they proposed to him, in the presence of some of his servants, to introduce a conversation on Atheism; he said to them softly, "Wait, if you please, till my servant leave the room: I do not wish my *throat cut* to-night."

But *sin* led on these men: they hated the purity of the Christian religion: "they chose darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil." But I must conclude for the present. In my next I will endeavor to give you a more pleasant picture.

In all benevolence, yours, &c.

M. S. CLAPP.

WORSHIPPING ASSEMBLIES—*No. I.*

THE APPEARANCE OF THINGS.

God is greatly to be feared in the assembly of the saints, and to be had in reverence of all that are about him.—*Psalm* lxxxix. 7.

A DEEP and radical reformation of all things connected with religious meetings, whether ordinary or extraordinary, is indispensable to the edification of Christians and the conversion of sinners. Our meetings of all sorts are greatly defective in many respects, and in none more visibly than in the dress and manners of the professed worshippers. The present costumes and general display are in extremely bad taste. They are so in the judgment of all well informed men of sense, out of the church; and certainly of all persons in the church of unquestionable piety.

There is a congruity between persons, places, and employments, which never can be violated without detriment and disgust, if there are any persons of good education present. To see worshippers appear in church as at a marriage feast, a presidential levee, a theatre, a dance—either in dress, manners, or general demeanor—strikes all persons of reflection as snow in summer, or a plaudit in the midst of a prayer.

We Americans are in advance of our English and European ancestors in this general apostacy from good taste and good sense. In the political and fashionable church of England at home—even in the metropolis of the empire itself, whither the grandees of the earth resort, there is not such a revolting incongruity between the dress and general appearance of noble lords and ladies, as is found in many of our backwoods meeting-houses. On the Sabbath and in the cathedral the nobility dress in their plainest garb. They reserve their splendid equipage, their courtly attire, their gems and coronets, their glittering decorations for courts and carnivals, for tilts and tournaments, and appear in the sanctuary as though they sought not to be worshipped, but to worship God. But we frequent the houses of prayer and the places of worship with all our "finery" upon us, as though our synagogues were theaures of fashion—and the "Ladies' Book," rather than the New Testament, was the guide of our devotions.

If, then, the outward garb be an index to the soul, or resembles the ruling passions within, how unwelcome are such worshippers at the footstool of the Almighty; and how unfit to offer acceptable sacrifices upon the altar of Christian worship! Can any one imagine that the sacrifices of such persons are the offerings of an humble mind, a broken heart, a contrite spirit, that trembles at the word of God? May we not rather say with the Prophet of Israel, "The show of their countenance doth witness against them;" for the daughters of Zion thus attired "are haughty, and walk with stretched forth necks and wanton eyes, walking and mincing as they go, making a tinkling with their feet"! Surely this is not "the beauty of holiness,"—"the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit, in the sight of God of great value."

Kings and Prophets, the saints and martyrs of other times, were oftener seen in sackcloth and ashes than in the gaudy fashions of a flippant and irreverent age. Their sense of propriety forbade that soul and body should disagree—that the outward man should betray the inward, and falsify the state of the mind. The Jews' religion taught men congruity, and especially that the exterior attire should always correspond with the inward plainness and simplicity of the heart.

"Slovenly neglect and rustic coarseness," though also incongruous with good Christian taste, are nevertheless more tolerable in Christian assemblies, than the gaiety and style now in vogue amongst the American communities: for, as a chaste and sensible Christian poet has said—

> ——————"A heavenly mind
> May be indifferent to her house of clay,
> And slight the hovel as beneath her care;
> But how a body so fantastic, trim,
> And quaint in its deportment and attire,
> Can lodge a heavenly mind, demands a doubt."

A very strong doubt, indeed! We trust, then, that among all the disciples of Christ there will be a very great reformation in this particular. They are by no means generally more exemplary than others in their dress and manners, or in their marked reverence for the institutions of religious wership. Gravity, sincerity, simplicity, humility, and spirituality are not more comely than requisite to our spiritual attainments and happiness. It is impossible to grow in grace, to improve in any of the Christian virtues, or to increase in the rational and moral enjoyments of our Christian profession, unless there is a perfect harmony in all our actions and professions. We are necessarily much influenced by external circumstances: our spirits are in our bodies, and our bodies are in our apparel; therefore, what we see and feel upon our persons must quite as much affect ourselves as our neighbors. Let any one who doubts try a few experiments upon himself: let him dress himself in

the proud costumes of the reigning fashions in Paris, London, or New York, and approach the sanctuary of the Lord: let him enter into his closet and shut the door, and pray to his Father who sees him in the secret place, and ask himself how he feels in communion with God, caparisoned with all the vain trimmings and blandishments of dissipated fancy upon him. Or let him approach the Lord's table in company with the saints who celebrate the Christian passover; and while he muses on the sufferings and death of the Son of God, hanging almost naked on the cursed tree, ignominiously expiring between two noted malefactors, let him look into his ruffled bosom, upon his golden trinkets, and fantastic apparel, and ask himself how this comports with all the affections of his heart absorbed in the contemplations of the judgment hall, the pretorium, and Mount Calvary. Then let him change his apparel, sell his finery, and gold to those who can afford no higher honors, no brighter glories—give the proceeds to the poor, and dress himself according to the Christian mirror, in the plainest and most unassuming garb, and try himself kneeling or lying upon the earth, in some deep cavern, in some lonely alcove, in some deep forest, or in the secret chamber in the lonely hour of even, or at midnight, and see how he feels in converse with his Divine Father, or seated thus among the faithful at the communion board, compared with himself on former occasions, with all the pride of fashion thickly set upon him. I am willing that his verdict, faithfully rehearsed, be final on any issue formed against my views of these congruities for which I plead.

But it is not only in this single item of dress that our public worshipping assemblies call for instant and thorough reformation. Our manners, I mean those of this age, are not sacred. Our attitude, our countenances, our demeanor, are not reverential: we feel not that we stand on holy ground, and therefore we do not loose our shoes from off our feet. The vacant stare, the wandering eye, the dissipated countenance, to say nothing of the foolish levity or pharisaic disdain, proclaim that our hearts are not engaged in spirit and in truth while we are professedly worshipping the Lord.

The undignified and irreverential, the witty and the sarcastic airs and remarks of some who too often speak in the name of the Lord, greatly contribute to this unpropitious and unsanctified state of things. The denunciation of Hosea has come upon them: "There shall be like people like priest," or "like priest like people;" for they act and reac upon each other; and the one cannot long be erroneous or corrupt without the other.

The radical error which works in all these forms is a want of a deep

and solemn conviction that the church is the house of God—the temple of the Holy Spirit—and that we are, especially and emphatically, in the presence of the Lord while we are engaged in his worship.—Were an angel to appear in our assemblies, could we act thus? All eyes, all ears, all hearts would be fixed upon him. Did we therefore realize the Divine presence, it would be impossible that we could act thoughtlessly, irreverently, or lightly on such occasions. Let every one imagine how he would dress himself—how he would demean himself—how he would prepare himself in expectation of meeting with the Lord and his brethren at any given time and place; and so let him act in the assemblies of the saints on all occasions.

But I am asked, What shall we do? Shall we assume a more solemn, reverential, and devotional appearance? Shall we present ourselves before the Lord in a more orderly and worshipful costume and attitude of body? Not, indeed, hypocritically; but sincerely and unfeignedly; not with the outward man only, but certainly with the outward as well as with the inward man, we should glorify God.—Both our bodies and our spirits are his. He has redeemed our spirits from sin and our bodies from the grave, and both should be dedicated to him. We do not ask the one without the other. We plead for the garb, the attitude, the demeanor—as well as the faith, the hope, the love, the actual piety, and the morality of the Christian. We demand all. We plead for complete sanctification—for a perfect consecration of our persons and powers to the Lord. We should evince in every practicable way, not only the Christian graces, but all the lesser ornaments of a good behaviour, in every action and in every display of mind and body.

But here, as in all things pertaining to God, to heaven, and eternal life, we must begin with the heart. "The heart must be kept with all diligence: for out of it are all the issues of life." But how shall we keep the heart right? Aye, that is the question! The answer is ready: The heart is to be kept right by keeping it much in company with God—by prayer and a constant meditation upon the word. These are sovereign remedies for all cardiac derangements. The heart is, indeed, made better, as wisdom saith, by the devotion of the countenance; but it is kept right only by prayer and meditation.

Christians of the present day have not time to prepare for heaven. They have yet to learn that the earth was made for the human body; the body for the soul; and the soul for God. But as it is now carnalized and under the dominion of the flesh, it needs much purification—it needs the blood of sprinkling, the sanctification of the Holy Spirit, all the ordinances of the church—to which must be added the spirit

of grace and supplication, private meditation and prayer. Then, indeed, under these influences the Christians, the Nazarites of heaven, as Jeremiah says, will be what God's people once were—"purer than the snow, whiter than the milk, more ruddy in body than rubies—their polishing of sapphires." A public assembly of these will be like a company of horses in Pharaoh's chariot, like polished pillars in an ivory palace, perfumed with frankincense, myrrh, and cassia—"looking forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners." A. C.

SIN—*A DIALOGUE.*

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 409.]

Eugenio. THE opposition of Satan has not only thus elicited, as you observe, a direct display of the Divine attributes; but it has also developed the nature of angels, and their astonishing gifts of wisdom and power; and has thus again indirectly tended still further to exhibit the transcendant character of these attributes in the Creator who bestowed them.

Philander. True. In dwelling upon what is revealed to us concerning the deep wisdom and knowledge, the stupendous power and might of Satan, and of those who in common with him partake of the angelic nature, we form lofty conceptions of creative power. And, to come nearer home, the same may be said of that development of *human* nature to which sin has given rise.

I have heard the wish expressed that man had remained in Eden in primeval innocency: but I confess that when I consider the astonishing exhibitions not only of the divine and angelic, but of the human nature which have been occasioned by the fall—the deep counsels of infinite wisdom counteracting the cunning of the Tempter; power surpassing power; love overcoming hatred; truth defeating falsehood; mercy and justice uniting to redeem a ruined world and elevate man to more than his original glory; and think of the wonderful scenes which it has already brought to view, and the awfully sublime events yet future, it seems to me that for man to have remained as he was in Eden, would have been in the comparison, a consummation imperfect, and inglorious.—Fancy, indeed, loves to depict the beauties of the garden of delights, the heritage of uncorrupted purity and untried fidelity. But it is because sad Experience has furnished the dark ground of the picture, that its brighter hues appear so brilliant and so charming. Often,

however, forgetful of the cause to which it owes its power to please, we contemplate it with the same feeling of joy commingled with regret, with which we recall to mind in maturity the halcyon days of childhood and of youth; in noontide heat, the dewy morn; or, in the midst of summer, the balmy gales and fragrant flowers of spring. Yet childhood were vain and futile, regarded as an end—as the highest destiny of a being susceptible of such elevation and perfection as man; and, although when spring has decked the trees of the orchard with flowers and perfumed them with odors, it seems a sad and unfortunate reverse when the stormy wind has scattered these beautiful blossoms upon the ground, and the trees are presented to us in dishabille, yet is the change approved by Reason, and noted with joy by Hope as the precursor of a fruitage still more delightful. Imperfect, then, as child hood without maturity; the dawn without the day; flowers without fruit, or spring without autumn, would man in Eden, the keeper of a garden, have appeared, if such had been his perpetual destiny—the first and last object of his creation.

How wonderfully has sin developed what man is, and what his capacities are! Even as it regards his animal nature, how ill qualified would we be to estimate the resources and energies with which it is endowed, if these were not called into action by disease, one of the consequences of sin! How impossible it would have been for us to have conceived of the vast variety of forms into which the animal constitution has been moulded by the morbid influences to which it has been subjected! What delicacy of organization these have superinduced! And to what forms of beauty and displays of genius, talent, and varied intellectual power has this in turn given rise? The whole animal and vegetable creation, indeed, has been affected and modified, and some of the most beautiful productions of these kingdoms of nature owe to these influences their existence. Thus the precious pearls which adorn the ivory neck of the fragile beauty, and the surpassing charms to which they give lustre, are alike the product of disease.

Eugenio. It is astonishing with what consummate skill the Divine Creator circumvents the designs of Satan, so that his confusion brings forth order; and the deformity which he creates results in beauty. But if God causes the wrath even of man to praise him, how much more the enmity and opposition of that mighty adversary by whom man was instigated to rebel!

Philander. It is, however, in the relation of sin to man's moral nature, that we see his ability to bring good out of evil most conspicuously displayed. Indeed, as moral virtue, considered as the quality of

an action, consists in mediocrity; and, as the quality of a person, in the habit of this mediocrity; it seems impossible to conceive of the existence either of virtue or virtuous persons, without supposing the extremes which constitute vice, and that probation which displays the strength and beauty of habitual morality. How could we appreciate courage were it not for cowardice and audacity; or how distinguish temperance without abstinence and excess? What could we know of generosity, without avarice and profusion; of modesty, without pride and diffidence; of mildness, without irascibility and softness; of magnificence, without ostentation and parsimony; or of condescension, without forbidding disdain or officious adulation? The Divine Being has, therefore, in the first place, made sin or evil the very means of distinguishing and bringing to view the nature and excellency of moral virtue. Thus the forbidden tree became to man the tree of the knowledge not of *evil* merely, but of *good* also; and good and evil, discovered at the same moment, were to him equally strange and novel.

But if the existence of evil be thus instrumental in displaying the quality of actions, it is no less efficient in exhibiting the character of agents. It becomes, as it were, the touch-stone of purity and perfection. As Paul says of schisms, one of its effects, it makes 'the approved manifest,' and gives conspicuity, excellency, and glory to those noble and illustrious persons who have endured its trials and resisted its power. "In this," says John, "the children of God are manifested, and the children of the devil." If there were no opposition, indeed, there could be no contest; if no contest, no victory; and if no victory, no crown.

Hence it is that sin is made to subserve this most important purpose, —to wit, that *of enabling man to form for himself a* CHARACTER. It gives him the opportunity to show his bent; to make an election; to enter into the service of God, or enrol himself in the ranks of the Adversary; and, under the plastic power of the influences to which he thus subjects himself, to be transformed into a noble and virtuous, or a degraded and malignant being. In respect to his capacities and susceptibilities, man is indeed a singular being. He can ascend the highest elevations, or plunge into the greatest depths; he can rise to heaven, or descend to hell; he can become the compeer of angels or of demons, and be assimilated to the character of God, or to that of Satan. It is the existence of evil which gives us to know this, by giving occasions to these developments of human nature. Without it man could make no choice; could form no character; and his nature would have remained undisclosed, like the power of the pendulum which is not permitted to vibrate.

Eugenio. Sin, then, would seem to be like the fire which tries every thing subjected to its action. If it be wood, chaff, stubble—it becomes a part of the fire to which it yields; but if gold, silver, or the diamond, it comes forth not only uninjured, but more lustrous and brilliant than before.

Philander. Sin is the chemical test which forms the analysis of human character. Or, to illustrate my views of agency still more clearly, I would compare man, from the hand of his Creator, to a ray of pure white light which has just issued from the sun; and sin to the prism or the falling shower which breaks up this ray into all the colors of the rainbow, and exhibits to view the brighter and the darker shades. Without the prism we could never have known that white light contained such various and such beautiful tints, nor without evil could we have become acquainted with the dignity and excellency of virtue, or with those different attributes of character which belong to the human, angelic, or divine nature. Without it, if man could not deteriorate, it would have been just as impossible for him to improve. Without sorrow, he would have had no joy; without fear, no hope; without poverty, no riches. Where there is no choice, there can be no liberty to choose; and if liberty of action be permitted, there can be no accountability. For if there be no possibility of demerit, there can be no merit; if no blame, no praise; if no punishment, no reward.

R. R.

A NEW INSTITTUION.

PLAN OF A LITERARY, MORAL, AND RELIGIOUS SCHOOL; OR THE UNION OF FOUR INSTITUTIONS IN ONE—THE COMBINATION OF THE FAMILY, THE PRIMARY SCHOOL, THE COLLEGE, AND THE CHURCH IN ONE GREAT SYSTEM OF EDUCATION.

I AM now about to divulge to this community, to philanthropists, to lovers of good order, to the Disciples of Christ a favorite scheme deeply impressed upon my mind; long cherished, and in the establishment and supervision of it, it is probable, *if the Lord will*, I shall close all my earthly projects.

In the first place, the location must be entirely rural—in the country, detached from all external society; not convenient to any town or place of rendezvous—in the midst of forests, fields, and gardens—salubrious air, pure water—diversified scenery of hills and vallies, limpid brooks, and meandering streams of rapid flowing water. Such is the spot which I have selected.

The buildings essential to the completion of this institution, are—the Stewart's Inn and Dormitories—the Family-House—three Mansions for Professors—Primary School-Rooms—College Proper, and the Church Edifice. An explanation of the uses of these buildings will develope some of the more prominent attributes and designs of this institution:—

1st. The Stewart's Inn is designed for the boarding and lodging of the students in attendance, not members of the Family-House, and for the entertainment of visiters and strangers.

2d. The Family-House is designed for a model family, in which children from 7 to 14 shall be admitted and constituted into a family, under an experienced and competent paternal and maternal government of the highest moral excellence. The management of this family, although it should consist of a hundred or more children, shall be that of a Christian household; in which religious and moral instruction from the Bible alone shall be as constant as morning and evening, as day and night succeed. Early rising, personal cleanliness, social courteousness, as well as daily readings and examinations of the sacred scriptures, accompanied with religious worship, shall be standing & immutable duties, always inculcated and always practised by the domestic government in the family-house. Time for the preparations of lessons for the primary school classes shall always be apportioned without any interruption of the family duties; but every thing shall be subordinate to the moral and religious instruction of the members of this family. The entire course of education in this institution, from the nursery class up to the senior course in the college, shall be conducted with a single eye to the destiny of man, to the supremacy of religion and morality. This house shall be spacious, well ventilated, and adapted to the accommodation of at least one hundred children. Should it be regarded as eligible, a second family-house for young ladies from 7 to 14, of the same dimensions and under the same species of domestic government, may be connected with the institution, and become an integral part of it. The multiplication of families of this kind would necessarily be in proportion to the exigencies and demands of society.

3d. The Professors' houses would, of course, be private dwellings; or, at most large enough for the accommodation of a few students who might prefer to be inmates in their families.

4th. The primary school rooms would be detached from the college proper, and arranged with a reference to the classes through which children from 7 to 14 would necessarily pass as preparatory to a college or church course.

5th. The college proper would not materially differ from similar

institutions, being a collection of rooms for recitation, for philosophic apparatus, for libraries, &c. The course of instruction would indeed materially differ; not so much in the sciences taught, as in the manner of teaching some of them; not so much in the languages, as in the course of reading necessary to the acquisition of them. The immoral and profane poets and writers would be excluded, and selections of only what is rational, moral, and subservient to good taste and criticism be substituted for the demoralizing and unrestricted readings and studies too often tolerated, if not enforced, in literary institutions.

6th. The church institution will need more explanation than any other. A portion of the college students will of course be Christians. These, together with a large number of young men, educated in other schools; and some uneducated in languages and sciences, will desire a knowledge of the Bible and of that sacred literature, indispensable to a thorough knowledge of the English Scriptures. Jewish and Christian history, chronology, ancient geography, ancient manners and customs, idioms, ecclesiastic affairs, &c. &c., must therefore become a regular course of lectures and of studies.

We want no scholastic or traditionary theology. We desire, however, a much more intimate, critical, and thorough knowledge of the Bible, the whole Bible as the Book of God—the Book of Life and of human destiny, than is usually, or indeed can be, obtained in what are called Theological Schools. As we make the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible our creed, our standard of religion and of all moral science, we have no hesitation in saying that this institution, from the nursery class upward to the church classes, shall make that volume a constant study. All science, all literature, all nature, all art, all attainments shall be made tributary to the Bible and man's ultimate temporal and eternal destiny.

This church institution shall, in one cardinal point of view, resemble the West Point military school. There, it is not the theory alone, but the military camp, the practice, the daily discipline of the god of war. In this institution it will not be the theory of a church—of Bible-reading, Bible-criticism, Bible-lectures—sermons—church order—Christian discipline; but the daily practice of these. This church will be in session seven days every week. The superintendant of this institution, or the professor in attendance, will be bishop *pro tempore* of the church. The young men, in all their readings, questions and answers, and exercises, shall rise, and speak, and act, as though they were, as in truth they are, members of a particular church met for edification and worship. Immoral and disorderly actions, should they ever occur, will be treated here as, in Christian discipline, they ought

to be, in the house of the Lord. Thus will the members of this institution be trained for filling any stations in the church of their ultimate location, to which they may be called by the brethren.

In one word, the objects of this (may I call it?) liberal and comprehensive institution will be to model *families*, *schools*, *colleges*, and *churches* according to the divine pattern shown to us in the oracles of reason, of sound philosophy, and of divine truth; and to raise up a host of accomplished fathers, teachers of schools, teachers of colleges, teachers of churches, preachers of the gospel, and good and useful citizens, or whatever the church or the state may afterwards choose to make of them.

As I propose the details hereafter, and only sketch the designs and landmarks which have been long cherished, I will only add a few fundamental provisions in this scheme:—

1st. The *atmosphere* of this institution, not physical only, but moral and religious, must be pure, perfectly pure, as the best state of present society can afford. Therefore, no price, no favor shall ever retain on the whole premises a youth of decidedly bad habits, or of loose morals. Indeed, no youth above 10 shall at all be received into the institution but upon credible testimonials of good moral character.

2d. None shall be received but those whose parents and guardians desire them to be taught the facts, precepts, and promises of the Holy Book, as well as its divine truth, its awfully sublime and glorious sanctions, and who do not approve of such a strict and systematic discipline as the severe morality of Christ inculcates.

3d. The physical vigor and health of the youth must be kept up and increased in summer by horticulture, in the cultivation and improvement of the college grounds, and in other athletic exercises; thereby increasing their knowledge of agriculture, horticulture, botany, &c.—These exercises shall not, however, be pursued so far as to become a toil or adrudgery, but so far as to corroborate the constitution and preserve good health.

4th. Economy in all expenditures shall be the order of every day, and of the management of the whole concern. Great pains will be taken to attain to a more rational costume in dress—to less expensive modes of living—to republican simplicity, if there be such a thing. All sorts of extravagance shall be discountenanced in this institution.

Enough, perhaps, for a general outline of the objects contemplated in founding such an institution, or in offering it to the public for their consideration and patronage.

Having now completed full 50 years, and on my way to 60, the greater part of which time I have been engaged in literary labors and

pursuits; and imagining that I possess some views and attainments which I can in this way render permanently useful to this community and posterity, I feel in duty bound to offer this project to the consideration of all the friends of literature, morality, and unsectarian Bible Christianity. I am willing to bestow much personal labor, without any charge, in getting up this institution, and also to vest a few thousand dollars in it; provided only our brethren—the rich and opulent especially—and those who have children to educate, will take a strong hold of it and determine to build up an establishment that may be made to themselves, their children, and many others a lasting and a comprehensive blessing.

I have the assurance that a charter—an act of incorporation can be obtained from the government of Virginia, that will give the necessary powers, and that will secure a faithful appropriation of all the funds of the institution, and exhibit a safe foundation for the investments and donations of all who have a heart and a purse consecrated to the Lord, to the cause of humanity—of literature, morality, and the Christian religion.

I have not begun to state the contemplated advantages of such an institution: this will be the work of a series of essays on Education, now in progress, and to which this overture, at this moment, is necessary. I am very sanguine of its success—because I am not only confident that it can be made a source of immense advantage to the cause we plead—to the whole community; but I believe our friends will have the discernment to see it, and that it is a real desideratum—not the rival of any existing institution; but aspiring to a stand and aiming at a character hitherto unassumed in this land, so far as my knowledge reaches.

I shall confidently calculate on raising such a school as is not in this land; and on receiving not the prayers only, but, with them, large and numerous bequests, and offerings equal to the grandeur and benevolence of the undertaking. Many orphans, many excellent young men, many thousands of choice spirits may be trained here to benefit earth, and to adorn heaven for ages to come. I am persuaded it can be done; and if we put our hands to it, the Lord willing, it must go forward: for being first assured that the object is expedient, necessary, good, and right, we can prosecute it with all our energies.

I now make the disclosure of my intentions. I have waited till Bacon College is fairly established and in successful operation. It is known to some that I had this matter in contemplation before that institution was established; and because I believed it to be needed in Kentucky and in the West, and because I ardently desired its success,

I did not open my views till its importance has been felt and its existence secured by the intelligence and liberality of that community. Besides, the institution that I contemplate is one of an entirely different character. *That* only approximates my plan in one point—the college proper. The family—the primary school, and the church departments of the new project are not within its purview. Indeed, we shall look upon its success as contributing to supplying our church department with many members for the critical study of the Holy Scriptures and ecclesiastic affairs. Its prosperity will greatly subserve our intentions. May the Lord prosper it, and bless the labors of our brethren!

I have now laid the main principles of the "Bill" before the community. It is now open to discussion. Will our brethren interested in this matter, or in the objects contemplated and proposed, speak out like men? We shall first want many thousands of dollars, and next many hundreds of students. Is the scheme rational, right, and necessary? If so, I am sure it is practicable. But again I say, friends and fellow-citizens, speak out. A. C.

A NEW DEPARTMENT IN THE HARBINGER.

IT is much to be lamented that so few families in this favored land are brought up under a rational and salutary Christian culture. Indeed, there are not a few parents that say they know not how to set about it. Not having been so educated themselves, they can form no plan for accomplishing that which they now see to be not only their paramount duty, but their most transcendant privilege. They see the folly of putting into the hands of children a catechism filled with question and answers, as though it were a labor-saving machine to prevent the toil of thinking at all; yet know not how to adopt a wiser or more salutary plan. It is, indeed, very commonly a difficult thing to teach others that which we have not learned ourselves. Hence a very great majority of Christian parents are eminently disqualified to educate their children for heaven and eternal life. Our periodicals do not generally lend much assistance in this most radical and essential of all matters.

They are also deficient, at least the Harbinger is, in elementary instructions to the converts. We are wont to regard those things as belonging to the mere abecedarian classes. We write for the senior, and forget the junior classes. We forget the immense influx of new converts, who are now, as we all once were, in need of some very plain lessons.

Again, there is a defect in critical and biblical discussions—in definitions and expositions of scriptural phrases, idioms, and allusions, for which there are many demands; and, indeed, in restoring a pure speech this is a cardinal item.

Now it has occurred to me that this periodical can be made a much more useful work than it ever has been, for all these purposes, by adapting a portion of every number to family instruction; more especially, too, since we have got all the heavy controversies off our hands. We desire to make the Harbinger an auxiliary to every Christian family in understanding and teaching the Bible; and thus we shall make a monthly visitation to the youth of all the families who patronize this work. Eight pages, at least, in every number, can most profitably be thus appropriated to the developments of the very elements of things spiritual and eternal, to the capacities of children and young men, as well as to those of the fathers in Israel.

My plan shall be the following:—A large family circle shall be constituted; and to meet the exigencies of the whole community it shall be divided into three classes—children under 7, from 7 to 14, and from 14 to 20, and adapt all the conversations on the Bible to these three classes, under appropriate names. There will be a suitable variety in each class, that through these we may be able to reach every case, and to discuss every question on the first principles of the oracles of God—perhaps, sometimes to the edification of persons not found in any of these classes. But our main design here will be to make the Harbinger on these points a family monitor and a familiar teacher of first, middle, and last things. While, then, as the Apostle said, we may speak wisdom to them that are advanced, we shall not forget the very rudimental principles of the oracles of God, but address the young and uneducated; and in this manner sketch out a rational and profitable system of family culture.

Indeed, we design, after the present volume, to make this periodical much more interesting to the young and to those who desire the intellectual and moral advancement of their families; and thus make it more the interest of all heads of families to have a monthly visit from the Harbinger as a familiar monitor and preceptor. We shall therefore endeavor, through the remaining months of this volume, to clear our files of the remains of old controversies, and be prepared for a somewhat new arrangement and more popular adaptation of our editorial labors to the exigencies of the times. Meanwhile, we apprise all our agents and patrons thus timously of our intentions, that they may obtain for us an additional number of readers; as a reward for which, we will promise them, that, in the ratio of their successful efforts to

extend our usefulness, we shall exert ourselves to be worthy of it, and make any superabundant proceeds arising from our labors the means of furthering the cause of humanity—of literature, religion, and morality.

We do not think it congruous to be ever and anon telling our friends and supporters either our doings or our intentions in the works of benevolence and of mercy; but we will say on the present occasion, and say it emphatically, that while we desire to have twice or thrice as many readers as we now have, it is not for the advancement of our personal and family worldly interests, but for the sake of actual means of doing good now and hereafter; and therefore I do not think, because I do not intend, that the doubling of my subscribers would much, if any thing, contribute to my private or personal advantage; but certainly it would advance my means of perfecting plans of usefulness yet in embryo, merely for the want of means.

I see many ways open to eminent usefulness in which I would desire to walk; but I do not think it is the duty of any man to aspire after doing any thing, however benevolent, for which he has not the means. He is only responsible for what he has, or for what he might have, by a reasonable, religious, and moral employment of himself, or the means and opportunities in actual possession. I do not, therefore, urge upon others any extra efforts on my personal behalf. But I give it as my opinion, that if I had five or ten thousand more readers, I could do not merely a corresponding good to them that read, but in the same ratio would have it in my power to benefit them who neither can nor will read any thing I write. Such are my opinions, and such are my wishes; but if any one differ from me rationally and conscientiously, he has as good a right to his opinion as I have to mine; and if he will not, therefore, use any exertions to second my views and aims, he shall have quite as much of my good wishes, if not of my esteem, as if he did. All of which is most respectfully and affectionately submitted to my numerous readers, and to my many old and long-tried faithful friends and patrons.

A. C.

COMMENCEMENT OF THE KINGDOM.

JAMESTOWN, Ohio, 27th August, 1839.

Dear brother Campbell,

IN looking over the "Christian Palladium" I have observed that the Editor frequently speaks of you to his readers; but never suffers you to speak to them through his columns. In the last number of that periodical I noticed a communication from Elder J. O. Harris, relative

to a debate between M. Gardner and J. B. Lucas, which fairly showed the difference between telling the truth and the whole truth. When the Elder speaks of the debate, he gives some of the proofs of M. Gardner, but not one of J. B. Lucas'; and when he speaks of the closing scene about the vote, he mentions a number of ministers of several denominations who attended, but was very careful not to tell that every one of those ministers were opposed to the vote, and that not one of them did vote. Then he goes on to say that about two hundred voted for Gardner, (pretty well stretched,) and not one for Lucas, that he saw. But here he forgot to tell the Editor that Mr. Lucas at the very commencement of this scene earnestly requested his friends not to vote for him at all. But in speaking of one of their preachers, a man of some influence, who bid good bye and left the house, he came very near letting the cat out of the wallet, by saying that all of that man's party left the house. Consequently there were none left to vote for Lucas, for that man's party and Lucas' party were the same. Strange, indeed, if Mr. Gardner could not get the vote of his own party, and of such as had said how they would vote before the debate commenced! Elder Sutton (a Baptist) stated publicly that he had heard some say that their minds were made up before they heard the debate. I have no hesitation in saying that if Elder Harris had stated *the whole truth*, his statement would have remained on file in the Editor's office to the end of that periodical. Of all the one-sided productions now extant, the "Christian Pailadium" lops the most.

One of the prominent points in the debate was, to fix the commencement of the kingdom of God on the earth. Mr. Lucas was of opinion that it did not properly commence until Pentecost. I am aware that there are various opinions on this subject: some say that it commenced with the ministry of John; others, that it commenced with the personal ministry of Jesus; and others, that it commenced at the resurrection of Jesus: and there are some who say it commenced on Pentecost—who place the ministry of John and of Jesus under the law. Now I conclude that all these are a little wrong on the subject, and will offer a few objections to each of them:—

1st. To those who say the kingdom commenced with the ministry of John, I beg leave to say, You have a kingdom without a King or a Priest: for none will say that John was a King or Priest, nor will they say that Jesus was then either a King or a Priest.

2d. To those who say the kingdom commenced with the personal ministry of Jesus, I would say, You have a kingdom without a Priest: for Jesus was not a Priest while on the earth, if Paul is to be believed: see his Epistle to the Hebrews.

3d. To those who say the kingdom commenced at the resurrection of Jesus, I would say, You have a very confused and inert kingdom. Your officers did not know what to be at: one said, I will go a-fishing; and another said, I will go with you; and others said, "We trusted that it had been he who should have redeemed Israel;" and all inquired saying, "Wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?"

4th. And to those who say the ministry of John and of Jesus were under the law, I would say, You lack a Priest to make atonement for sins: for John ministered the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins, without any reference to a Priest to make atonement; and

Jesus forgave sins by his word, without sacrifice or atonement such as the law required. He did, indeed, once direct a parcel of lepers to go to the Priest and make an offering according to the law; but they were all healed before they got there. Therefore, upon a view of the whole premises, I conclude that the ministry of John and Jesus was separate from the law and from the gospel dispensations. It was a period peculiar to itself. I will offer an additional reason why I do not think it belonged to the gospel dispensation: It will be admitted by all, that without the fact *that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God*, the gospel would be left without a foundation. And it cannot be denied that the revelation of that fact was prohibited by Jesus himself, while on the earth, and that it was not published until Pentecost: see Matth. xvi. 20., and Mark ix. 9.———As ever yours,

M. WINANS.

My dear brother—

In one sentence, the most uncandid, one-sided, and injurious paper that comes to my office, the 'Catholic Telegraph' and 'Baptist Banner' not excepted, is the aforesaid 'Christian Palladium.' Never was a people more completely blinded and duped by an Editor, than the readers of this 'Christian Palladium' under its present and former administration—provided only they believe their scribes. But my joy is, that its time is short. Truth shall rise and stand erect; when error, ashamed and confounded, will hang its head and fall forever.

Your reasons against the fixing of the commencement of the kingdom of God, in its Christian form, at any period before the day of Pentecost, are good, and conclusive to my mind. One of the best reasons for fixing its commencement on that day is found in the fact, that the King himself was not anointed Lord of all, and did not receive all authority in heaven and on earth previous to his ascension into heaven; consequently could not enter upon the administration of the new organization. On earth Jesus had no throne. He was only heir apparent. In heaven he sat down upon his throne, and the first act of his administration was the sending down of his spirit to prepare his ambassadors for setting up the earthly state of the kingdom of heaven.

A. C.

MAN WITHOUT RELIGION.

Without religion, what would remain to be shared with those we love? In what thoughts should we understand one another? Ah! how poor would be our language, with what trembling would our eyes meet! with what despair should we bid farewell, and lose each other! Should we really belong to each other here below? Our souls would but touch in passing, they could not mingle together. Love and happiness, the apparent ends of our destiny, would contradict each other. The selfish man would alone be prudent. Well, let selfishness and irreligion triumph together; snows, darkness, and annihilation are their empire. Oh! deprived of religion, what is man? What does he find in himself to love, to cherish, to protect?——Degerando.

GENERAL CAUSE OF IRRELIGION.

Perhaps the most frequent and general cause of irreligion, is the difference which springs from frivolity, or from that pre-occupation of the mind with material interests, which makes man morally puerile. It is a want of reflection in that dissipated being who has neither interrogated his destiny, nor consulted his conscience. It is the sleepiness of a heart that has not yet felt the want of great and generous affections. It is the consequence of slavery to sensual pleasures, and of the reckless dulness that accompanies all servitude.——Is.

THE CHRISTIAN SYSTEM.

THIS work is just out of press, and I presume about being ready for delivery. The preface to the 2d edition is in the following words:—

The present edition substitutes, for the first part of the last, a series of essays on the Christian System, and somewhat enlarges on the second. The continual misrepresentation and misconception of our views on some very fundamental points of the Christian system, seem, at the present crisis, to call for a very definite, clear, and connected view of the great outlines and elements of the Christian Institution; and more especially with a reference to a great question which we anticipate soon to be the all-absorbing question of Protestant Christendom, viz.—*How may schisms cease, and all Christians unite, harmonize, and co operate in one great community, as at the beginning?*

Things ecclesiastic are moving forward to a new issue. The Christian system is undergoing an examination in the present day, both as to its evidences and signification, wholly unprecedented since the days of the grand defection. Such an age is always an age of extremes: but things will regulate themselves and settle down on the true foundation. "Many are running to and fro;" and certainly knowledge is on the increase.

The Christian system, as unfolded in the following essays, would, but for the special essays on the Kingdom of Heaven, Remission of Sins, Regeneration, and Breaking the Loaf, have been more systematically and fully developed. Sundry points are but meagerly discussed in the new essays, because of their recurrence in those elaborate articles which have been so often published. We have, indeed, aimed first at giving a general view, leaving the important details on the most disputable points for those essays.

Instead of the "Dialogue on the Holy Spirit," so generally read and so fully discussed, we have added a few essays on CHURCH ORDER, as a part of the Christian system: thus endeavoring to give to the book all the chances of being as useful as possible to those who are desirous of a perfect understanding of our attainments in Christian knowledge. We speak for ourselves only; and while we are always willing to give a declaration of our faith and knowledge of the Christian system, we firmly protest against dogmatically propounding our own views, or those of any fallible mortal, as a condition or foundation of church union and co-operation. While, then, we would, if we could, either with the tongue or the pen, proclaim all that we believe, and all that we know, to the ends of the earth—*we take the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible, as the foundation of all Christian union and communion.* Those who do not like this, will please show us a more excellent way.

A. CAMPBELL.

BETHANY, Va., June 13, 1839.

The new essays in this work are twenty-eight, and under the following captions:—The Universe; The Bible; God; Son of God; Spirit of God; Man as he was; Man as he is; Purposes of God concerning Man; Religion for Man, and not Man for Religion; Sacrifice for Sin; Attributes of a real Sin-Offering; Christ the Light of the World; Lordship of the Messiah; Faith in Christ; Repentance; Baptism; Christian Confession of Faith; Conversion; Regeneration; Christians and persons pardoned, justified, sanctified, adopted, and saved; Gift of the Holy Spirit; The Christian Hope; Doom of the Wicked; Summary View of the Christian System of Facts; the Body of Christ; the Christian Ministry; Christian Discipline; Expediency; Heresy.

Most of these essays are brief, because of the Extras, which contain much matter that would otherwise come under some of these chapters. These essays give a completeness to the work in reference to the present demands of society. I select one of them, not so much as a specimen of the others, but because of numerous queries on hand touching the items on which it treats. The subject of the Christian ministry, or service, is one of increasing importance and interest amongst ourselves and others. The paragraphs in all the original essays are numbered for easy reference, as in the following specimen:—

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

I. "He gave some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors, and teachers for the perfecting of the saints for *the work of the ministry*, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ," &c. For the setting up of the Christian institution officers extraordinary were needed. So was it in the Jewish, and so is it in every institution human and divine. But when an institution is set up, it only requires an ordinary ministry or administration of its affairs. All the extraordinary gifts vouchsafed to Moses, and to the Apostles and Prophets of the gospel institution, ceased when these institutions were fully developed and established. Still a regular and constant ministry was needed amongst the Jews, and is yet needed among the Christians; and both of these by divine authority.

II. Natural gifts for a natural state of things, and supernatural gifts for a supernatural state of things, are, in the wisdom of both God and man, apposite and needful. Hence, even in the apostolic age, there were officers without, as well as with, miraculous endowments. "Having, then, gifts differing according to the office, or grace that is given to us—if prophecy, let us prophesy according to the measure of our faith; if ministry, let us attend on our ministering; he that teacheth, on teaching; he that exhorteth, on exhortation; he that distributeth, with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence." God has therefore conferred various gifts on the church for the effectual administration of its affairs. He has placed in it "*helps* and *governments*," as well as Apostles and Prophets.

III. The standing and immutable ministry of the Christian community is composed of Bishops, Deacons, and Evangelists. Of each of these there is but one order, though possessing great diversities of gifts. There have been bishops, deacons, and evangelists, with both ordinary and extraordinary gifts. Still the office is now, and ever was, the same. In ancient times official and unofficial persons sometimes possessed miraculous gifts. Those in high office were also generally of those most eminently gifted with extraordinary powers. Superficial readers have, therefore, sometimes concluded that, inasmuch as bishops, deacons, and especially evangelists, frequently possessed these manifestations of the Holy Spirit, with the ceasing of those gifts, the offices themselves also expired. This is a great mistake. Officers there must be while there are offices, or services to be performed. So long as the human system needs sight, hearing, and feeling, there will be eyes, ears, and hands. So long also as the Christian body is an organized body, having many services to perform, it must have organs or officers by which to enjoy itself and operate on society.

IV. There are, indeed, necessarily as many offices in every body as there are services to be performed to it, or by it. This is the root and reason of all the offices in all the universe of God. Our planet needs diverse celestial services to be performed to it. Hence the sun, moon, and stars are celestial officers ministering to it. The eye, the ear, the tongue, the hand, the foot, are, for the same reason, officers in the human body, essentially serving it in its vital interests and enjoyments;

and by means of these organs, it performs important functions to other bodies.

V. Experience, as well as observation, has taught us that "practice makes perfect," and that "whatever is every person's business is no person's business." Hence arose the custom among men of communicating certain offices to particular individuals. The philosophy of such elections and ordinations is found in the fact, that special services are best performed by special organs or agents, whose special province and duty it is to attend to them.

VI. As the Christian system is a perfect system, it wisely provides for its own perpetuity and prosperity, by creating all necessary offices and filling them with suitable persons. We have said these offices are three, and of perpetual, because of necessary existence. *Bishops*, whose office it is to preside over, to instruct, and to edify the community—to feed the church of the Lord with knowledge and understanding—and to watch for their souls as those that must give account to the Lord at his appearing and his kingdom, compose the first class. *Deacons*, or servants—whether called treasurers, almoners, stewards, doorkeepers, or messengers, constitute the second. For the term *deacon* originally included all public servants whatever, though now most commonly confined to one or two classes; and improperly, no doubt, to those only who attend to the mere temporary interests of the community. They are distinguished persons, called and commissioned by the church, (and consequently are always responsible to it,) to serve in any of these capacities. Evangelists, however, though a class of public functionaries created by the church, do not serve it directly; but are by it sent out into the world, and constitute the third class of functionaries belonging to the Christian system.

VII. As there is more scrupulosity on some minds concerning the third class of Evangelists, than concerning either Bishops or Deacons, we shall take occasion to speak more explicitly and fully upon the nature and necessity, as well as upon the authority of this office. Evangelists, as the term indicates, are persons devoted to the preaching of the word, to the making of converts, and the planting of churches. It is, indeed, found but three times in the New Covenant; but the verb from which it comes—viz. to *evangelize*, is, in some of its branches, found almost sixty times in that volume. "To evangelize" and "to do the work of an evangelist" are phrases of equal import, and indicate the same duties, rights, and privileges.

VIII. Among the offices which were comprehended in the apostleship, none required more varied endowments than that of the Evangelist. The gift of tongues was amongst the qualifications necessary to those who, after the ascension, first undertook this work. But the qualifications for this office, so far as the gift of tongues or the knowledge of language is concerned, are not immutably fixed. It depends upon the field of labor which the Evangelist is to occupy, whether he must speak one language or more. His work is to proclaim the word intelligibly and persuasively—to immerse all the believers, or converts of his ministry—and to plant and organize churches wherever he may have occasion; and then teach them to keep the commandments and ordinances of the Lord.

IX. Take, for example, the sketch given us by Luke of the labors

of Philip the Evangelist, one of the first who wore that designation. One of the seven ministers of the Jerusalem church, after his diaconate was vacated by the dispersion of that community, he commenced his evangelical labors. He turned his face towards Samaria, and preached and baptized amongst the Samaritans: for, we are told, when the Samaritans believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the Lord Jesus, they were baptized both men and women. He also converted the Ethiopian Eunuch; and then passing from Azotus, he "preached *in all the cities* till he came to Cesarea," where he afterwards resided. The next notice we have of him is found Acts xxi. 8. "We," says Luke, "who were of Paul's company, departed, and came into Cesarea, and entered into the house of Philip the Evangelist, one of the seven, and abode with him. He had four virgin daughters that did prophesy." Evident, then, it is that he obtained the title *Evangelist* from his itinerant labors in the gospel and in the converting of men. His possession of the gift of the Holy Spirit was no more peculiar to him as an evangelist, than as deacon of the church in Jerusalem; for while in the diaconate of that church he seems to have been as full of the Holy Spirit as when visiting all the cities from Azotus to Cesarea.

X. Convening converts into societies, and organizing them into worshipping assemblies, are inseparably connected with the right of converting men. Casually, in his letters to Timothy, Paul seems to define the work of an Evangelist. He says, "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and teaching; endure affliction; *do the work of an Evangelist*; fulfil thy 'ministry." "Let no man despise thy youth. Till I come give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to teaching. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, [or cultivate and exercise the office conferred upon thee,] according to prophecy—by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery or eldership." "Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them, that thy profitting may appear to all: take heed to thyself and to thy teaching; continue in them: for in doing this, thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee."* This seems to be the office of an Evangelist which the Lord gave the church after his ascension.

XI. Setting things in order in the churches—the committing the same office to faithful men, who shall be able to instruct others—the ordaining of elders, and a general superintendance of the affairs of churches, seem to have been also lodged in the hands of Timothy and Titus as agents of the Apostles. How far these works are yet necessary, and how far the superintendance of them may be safely lodged in the hands of select Evangelists as *respects infant communities*, may be, with many, a question of dubious interpretation. But that Evangelists are to separate into communities their own converts, teach and superintend them till they are in a condition to take care of themselves, is as unquestionably a part of the office of an Evangelist as praying, or preaching, or baptizing.

XII. But we shall be asked, 'Is not preaching and baptizing, and even teaching, the common privilege of all disciples, as they have op-

* 1. *Timothy* iv. 2. *Timothy* iv.

portunity!' And we also ask in answer, 'Is it not the privilege of all fathers to teach their own children, and to preside over their own families? But who will thence infer, that all fathers are teachers and presidents, does not shock more common sense, than he who infers that all disciples, as such, are Evangelists, pastors, and teachers, because we concede that in certain cases it is the privilege of all citizens of Christ's kingdom to preach, baptize, and teach. Every citizen of Christ's kingdom has, in virtue of his citizenship, equal rights, privileges, and immunities. So has every citizen of the United States. Yet all citizens are not legislators, magistrates, judges, governors, &c. Before any community, civil or religious, is organized, every man has equal rights to do what seemeth good in his own eyes. But when organized, and persons appointed to office, then whatever rights, duties, or privileges are conferred on particular persons, cannot of right belong to those who have transferred them; any more than a person cannot both give and keep the same thing.

XIII. But there are some duties and privileges we cannot wholly communicate to others. Parents cannot wholly transfer the education of their children to others; neither can a master transfer all his duties to a steward or overseer. No more can the citizens of Christ's kingdom wholly transfer their duties to preach and teach Christ. To enlighten the ignorant, to persuade the unbelieving, to exhort the disobedient when they fall in our way and we have the ability or the opportunity is an intransferable duty. Even the church of Rome, with all her clerical pride, commands and authorizes *lay baptism* when a Priest is not convenient. A Christian is by profession a preacher of truth and righteousness, both by precept and example. *He may of right preach, baptize, and dispense the supper, as well as pray for all men, when circumstances demand it.* This concession does not, however, either dispense with the necessity of having evangelists, bishops, and deacons; nor having them, does it authorize any individual to assume to do what has been given in charge to them. Liberty without licentiousness, and government without tyranny, is the true genius of the Christian institution.

XIV. While, then, the Christian system allows every man "as he has received a gift to minister as a good steward of the manifold grace of God," it makes provision for choosing and setting apart qualified persons for all its peculiar services, necessary to its own edification and comfort, as well as to its usefulness in the world. It provides for its own perpetuity and its growth in the wisest and most practical manner. Its whole wisdom consists in four points:—1st. It establishes the necessary offices for its perpetuity and growth. 2d. It selects the best qualified persons for those offices. 3d. It consecrates or sets those persons apart to those offices. 4th. It commands them to give themselves wholly to the work, that their improvement may keep pace with the growth of the body, and be apparent to all. Can any person point out an imperfection in this plan?—!

XV. All its officers, whether for its services at home or abroad, when fully proved, are to be formally and solemnly set apart by the imposition of the hands of the presbytery or eldership of the church. The whole community chooses—the seniors ordain *This is the apostolic tradition.* Let those unacquainted with the volume examine the apostol-

ic law and usage; Acts vi. 2—6. So the Christian system in its elections and ordinances began. *It is immutable.* Therefore this system obtains in all cases. The qualifications for any office are always founded in the nature of the office. They are generally detailed, but not always, because the *work to be done* is the best guide in ascertaining the qualifications of the doer of it.

XVI. We say the seniors or elders always ordain. Popery says, 'None but those on whom the apostolic hands have been laid can of right ordain.' *Such an idea is not in the Christian system.* The seniors always lay on hands, whether hands have been laid on them or not. This is true Protestantism. Better still, it is true Bibleism. *Nay, it is the Christian system.* The Apostles laid on hands because *seniors*, and not because *apostles*. This is the jet of a controversy of fifteen hundred years' standing. It has been very generally, almost universally misstated and overlooked Protestants are as much Papists in this, as the Papists are Protestants in disowning Protestantism. It is assumed by Romanists, and conceded by Protestants, that "*holy hands*" are official hands by a *jure Divino*. They are sometimes, but not always. But *Christian elders*, (for I do not mean mere old men,) who have long walked in the ways of the Lord, have holy hands, and much more power with and from the Lord, than ever dwelt in any pontiff or pretended vicar of Christ, in twelve hundred and sixty years.

XVII. In proof that seniors lay on hands, we appeal to the fact, Acts vi., for the Apostles were the oldest converts in Jerusalem. We appeal also to the fact that the presbytery or eldership laid hands on Timothy, and gave him the gift or office of an evangelist. And are there two rules of ordination in one system! Paul and Barnabas, though *Apostles*, were themselves ordained by the church of Antioch by its presbytery. Consequently, *seniors in Christ, as such*, can, in divine warrant, lay hands on any persons, for any office to which the church has elected them. It must be done also by prayer and fasting. See Acts vi. 6.; xiii. 3.; xiv. 23.

XVIII. Persons may be juniors in years and seniors in Christ. Timothy, says Paul, "*lay hands suddenly on no man.*" This implies that the ordained were juniors in the Lord; and until they had attained some character and standing, seniors, (even Timothy himself,) were not to consent to their ordination. Perhaps it may be necessary to say that classic presbytery and the presbytery of a church are very different institutions. The Apostles ordained *elders* (a presbytery) in every church. They did not make young men old, but set apart those that were seniors in the Lord to the office of overseers. They did not make juniors *seniors*, but they made elders *bishops*.

XIX. The community, the church, the multitude of the faithful, are the fountain of official power. This power descends from the body itself—not from its servants. Servants made by servants are servants of servants; and such are all the clergy of the Man of Sin. But the body of Christ, under him as its head, animated and led by his spirit, is the fountain and spring of all official power and privilege. How much surer and purer is ecclesiastic authority thus derived from Christ the head, immediately through his body, than when derived through a long, doubtful, corrupt dynasty of bishops or pontiffs! The church is the mother of all the sons and priests of God; and to look for authori-

ty to her servants or creatures, as do all sorts of Papists, whether Catholic or Protestant, is to worship and serve the creature more than the Creator—a species of idolatry worthy only of the darkest night of the darkest day of the dark ages.

XX. But the church needs messengers for special occasions—not only her stated deacons and ministers, but ministers extraordinary. These two are selected by the church or churches in a given district, and *commissioned by their letters*. They are not consecrated by imposition of hands, but *approved by letters* from the community. Are we asked for authority? We produce it with pleasure. 1 Cor. xvi. 3., is just to the point: "And," says Paul to the saints in Corinth, "when I come *whomsoever you shall approve by letters*, them will I send to bring your liberality to Jerusalem." This is the apostolic usage in such cases. In the second epistle Paul says, "We have sent with Titus the brother (Luke we opine) whose praise is in the gospel, (written by him,) throughout all the churches—who was also *chosen by the churches* to travel with us with this bounty," &c.

XXI. The Christian system demands for its perpetuity and for its prosperity at home and abroad, bishops, deacons, and evangelists. Its bishops teach, preside, and execute the laws of Christ in all its convocations. The deacons, a large and diverse class of functionaries, composed of stewards, treasurers, almoners, door-keepers, &c., as the case may require, wait continually upon its various services. Its evangelists possessed of proper qualifications, ordained and consecrated to the work of the Lord in converting sinners and planting churches, by a presbytery, or a board of seniors competent to the prudent discharge of this duty, are constantly engaged in multiplying its members. These ministers of the word are commanded to be wholly engrossed in this work, and consequently to be fully sustained by their brethren in it. They are held responsible to all the holy brethren, and to the Lord at his appearing and his kingdom, for the faithful discharge of that sacred trust confided in them.

XXII. What an efficient institution is that over which Christ presides, when well understood and fully carried out in all its details! With its bishops and deacons at home, and its evangelists abroad, wholly devoted to the faithful discharge of their respective trusts; men of experience, faith, piety, morality, full of zeal, energy, benevolence, co-operating with all similar institutions, supported by the prayers and free-will offering of all the united people, having the love of God in their hearts, and heaven in their eye, what may they not achieve of glory to God, of good to men, and honor to themselves! Of such an army of the faith, in full operation and concert, it might indeed be asked, "Who is this that looketh forth as the morning, fair as the moon, bright as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners!"

CHURCH EDIFICATION.

As we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office; so we, the many, are one body in (or under) Christ; and every one members one of another. Having, then, gifts differing

to the grace that is given to us; whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that teacheth, on teaching; or he that exhorteth, on exhortation; he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that showeth mercy, with cheerfulness.—Rom. xii. 4—8. Now you are the body of Christ, and members in particular. And God hath set some in the church; first, apostles; secondarily, prophets; thirdly, teachers. Let all things be done to edification. Let all things be done decently and in order. 1 Cor. xii. 27, 28., and xiv. 26, 40. You are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth into a holy temple in the Lord: in whom you also are builded together, for a habitation of God through the Spirit.—To the intent that now to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places, might be known by the church. The manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord—which things the angels desire to look into. There is one body and one Spirit, even as you are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all. But to every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ. Wherefore he saith, when he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts to men. And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers;—for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ; from whom the whole body, fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of evety part, maketh increase of the body to the edifying of itself in love. Eph. ii. 20–22. and iii. 10, 11. 1 Pet. i. 12. and iv. 4–8, 11–13, 16. These things write I to thee (son Timothy) hoping to come to thee shortly; but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground (or support) of the truth. Till I come give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine (or teaching:) Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. Meditate upon these things, give thyself wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear to all. Take heed to thyself, and to the teaching: continue in them; for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee. Yet evil men and seducers will grow worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived. But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned, and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them; and that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise to salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All (holy) scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished to all good works. I charge thee, therefore, before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ (who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom)

preach the word: be instant in season—out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and teaching. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine: but after their own lusts will they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they will turn away their ears from the truth, and will be turned to fables. 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15. and iv. 13–16. and 1 Tim. iii. 13–17. and iv. 1–4. For this cause left I thee (son Titus) in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city as I had appointed thee. Titus i. 5.

In the above collation of scripture documents respecting the constitution and edification of the Christian church, the following items are distinctly noticeable, and evidently demand most serious attention:—

First. That the church of Christ upon earth is wholly a divine organization, the adaptation and structure of which are the result of the supreme love, wisdom, and goodness of God, for the most sublime and heavenly purposes.

Second. That the blissful and immediate intention of its organization is the progressive edification and ultimate perfection of every individual member, or particle of this divine structure.

Third. That this divine perfection will ultimately consist in love—the love of the Father, and of Christ, and of each other, and of all holy intelligences.

Fourth. That the due performance of the relative official duties of all the members, *respectively*, is the constitutional means divinely appointed and provided for this blissful purpose.

Fifth. That all Christian duties, personal and official, are clearly taught and provided for in the holy scriptures; and must, of divine necessity, be thence explicitly deduced, that they may justly claim a divine authority.

Contemplating the Christian church in the light of the above scriptures, it appears a most august and sacred institution—a divinely organized society of new creatures—a "habitation of God through the Spirit"—the admiration and resort of angels; and for this cause ought the women to have their heads covered in the church. 1 Cor. xi. 10. Surely, then, in such a divinely distinguished society every thing should be most solemnly conducted;—every thing to edification:—The ordinances of divine worship should be duly administered;—every thing done decently and in order. "Order is Heaven's first law:" nothing can be done right without it.

True, indeed, we are not divinely provided with a religious formula or ritual, as the Jews were: the reason is, we presume, because it is not necessary. Some, however, think they find something of this kind in the 42d verse of the 2d chapter of Acts; but this seems rather forced and imaginary, as appears from the fact, that the breaking of the bread is put before prayer, which never was the case in partaking of the Lord's supper, nor even of a common meal. But to return:—Although a divinely authorized order was not deemed necessary; yet there must be a certain conventional order in every society, which is in the habit of meeting at set times for set purposes; else no social business could be consistently transacted. Now if the business of such meetings be definite and intelligible there can be no difficulty respecting the necessary adjustments; and surely this is the case in our

weekly church meetings, for the day and the exercises are all of divine appointment. What remains, then, to be determined, but the conventional hours and the order of the exercises? And these things surely every church has a right to determine according to its circumstances. In the mean time, in order to come to the subject before us, we shall propose a certain medium which both reason and experience evince to be quite practicable; and, we should think, quite eligible to churches in country situations; namely, to meet every first day at 10 o'clock, and dismiss at 2; thus taking their social hours out of the very midst of the day. And surely no church should think four hours in seven days too much to spend together for social edification.

Next as to the exercises and their order. The exercises, distinctly and numerically considered, are singing, praying, reading, teaching, exhorting, eating the Lord's supper, and the contribution for benevolent and charitable purposes; seven in all. These are the ordinary stated exercises for public and social edification. Then, as to their order, this may be optional; yet time, the great index to human affairs, would seem to indicate our commencement with the celebration of the resurrection, that glorious event which has given us the joyful day that brings us together—the Lord's day,—that is, the day of *his* resurrection, "who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification." "This joyful day let *us* observe: redemption work is done:" and we who believe are *justified* from all things: so that in celebrating his resurrection we celebrate our own justification. And to do this in a due and suitable manner would well occupy the first hour of our meeting; in singing, praying, reading, and singing, with a special reference to this glorious event, and the blessings thence resulting. This would lead us to read with special remarks, every Lord's day, some one of the four testimonies respecting the resurrection. Thus would we be led to read and consider the whole amount of the four records every month, upon this all-important subject. And, if the month contained five first days, still availing ourselves of the great index—time—we could furnish ourselves with a fifth testimony, accompanied with a most interesting and luminous display of the truth and importance of the subject, by adverting to the 15th chapter of Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians. So much for the first section of our weekly social worship. Let the second be teaching for another hour.

This exercise to consist in reading the portions appointed last Lord's day, for the due consideration of the congregation through the week. This reading to be duly attended to, in the mean time, by all that can read, every one with open book. These portions should be taken up in regular order from the beginning of both Testaments; and after being distinctly and emphatically read, due attention should be paid to the contents by such appropriate remarks and questions, as will distinctly impress the minds of all concerned, with the moral and religious instructions they are divinely intended to convey. *This*, with the *reading*, is the proper office of the teachers.—Intermit half an hour;—after intermission, recommence with singing: then proceed to the supper by reading the appropriate portions out of the Evangelists, as was done in the morning with respect to the resurrection. And here let it again be observed, that if there should happen to be four first days in

the month, and we feel disposed to be guided by the regular succession of time, we may avail ourselves of the prophetic testimony of Isaiah, chapter 53d, who, because of his historic style, and of the circumstantial clearness and fulness of his predictions respecting the person, sufferings, and glory of the Messiah, is sometimes called the fifth Evangelist. The supper being thus duly attended to, according to the manifest design of the institution, and this third part of our public exercises closed with singing, there still remains a fourth; and, according to the above order, the concluding part; namely, the contribution for benevolent and charitable purposes; for every church is, in its proper character, a benevolent society, to supply the wants of the poor and needy, and to promote the conversion of the world; and is therefore divinely furnished with deacons, the proper officers for this very purpose. In the mean time, while this is in doing, just before dismissal, if any brother has a word of exhortation, which he feels desirous to impress upon the congregation, let him do it with all convenient brevity.

Thus, according to the above arrangement, may all things, that are to be staledly attended to, "be done decently and in order." And whatever plan of proceeding may be adopted, surely none of those things should be consentaneously and statedly omitted.

THOMAS CAMPBELL.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

THE YEARLY MEETINGS IN TRUMBULL COUNTY, OHIO.

The Disciples of Christ, in the county of Trumbull, annually meet on the Friday preceding the last Lord's day in August, and continue their meeting for four days! This year the meeting was held at the new village on the canal, called Newton Falls. It was decidedly the largest and most orderly meeting we have ever seen on the Western Reserve; and, we might add, the most happy. It was attended from the first hour to the last word, by an intelligent and attentive auditory. On Lord's day the audience was variously computed by good judges from 5 to 7000 persons. It was computed that more than a thousand Disciples attended, and a very respectable number of the Bishops and the Evangelists of the churches of that county and vicinity. The discourses on each day possessed a unity in their design, with such a variety as greatly interested, and I believe much edified the hearers. During the meeting forty-two persons acknowledged the Lord; and had it not been for some showers of rain about the close of the meeting, it was supposed that some others would have been added.

I would suggest to the brethren of that meeting, and to many others through them, the necessity of having the ground laid off and seated more commodiously with special reference to the Lord's supper.—Where a thousand or twelve hundred communicants are expected, the ground should be laid off in two squares or oblongs, with a wide alley in the centre, sufficient for the deacons to attend upon the guests. The hour for that observance ought to be previously fixed, and all the

brethren and sisters in their respective seats at the appointed time. The number of deacons in attendance ought to be in proportion to the assembly; say, in the ratio of one to fifty communicants. These ought to be able to walk not only in the central alley, but on each side of the two squares, so that four deacons in one rank, one on each side of the two companies, may pass and repass without obstruction. Twenty deacons for one thousand communicants so arranged, could wait on them in a very few minutes, and the brethren with much more concentration of mind; more edification and comfort to themselves; more reverence for the Author of the institution; and with a more solemn comeliness more deeply impressive on all the spectators, partake of the sacred memorials of their Saviour's love.

From this meeting we proceeded, *via* Warren and Mantua, to Bedford, Cuyahoga county, to the annual meeting of the counties of Medina and Cuyahoga. This meeting annually commences on Friday before the first Lord's day in September, and continued this year four days. On our way thither we spoke at Warren and Mantua. Three were immersed at Warren. The meeting at Bedford was held at the meeting-house of the zealous, hospitable, and much beloved sister Willes, the new edifices erected by the brethren not being yet finished. A large area adjoining the meeting-house, enclosed and covered, was well seated for the occasion. The congregation here also was immense, though not so large as that at Newton Falls. Great good order also prevailed at this meeting. Twenty-six persons were immersed. We were sorry to learn that the meeting adjourned sooner than the community expected and desired, and that thus sundry persons intending to be immersed were disappointed. The number of communicants was nearly equal to that at Newton Falls. The same remarks on the arrangement of the ground, and on the dispensation of the supper, are as applicable to the brethren of Cuyahoga as to those of Trumbull county. Indeed, there has hitherto, almost in all places, been a remissness or negligence in this important matter, not in harmony with our zeal in other things.

After this meeting the preachers present held a short session of the Preachers' School, for the purpose of reviewing the discourses delivered on the occasion. Some judicious remarks were made, and some useful criticisms were offered on the discourses examined. It was resolved unanimously that at each yearly meeting there will be a session of the preachers present, for the purpose of reviewing the discourses delivered during the meeting; the object being the improvement of one another in both matter and manner, in all things that may contribute to greater usefulness.

Another important resolution was unanimously adopted with a reference to strengthening one another and forming a more effectual co-operation, that it be suggested to the churches to take into consideration the propriety of having one annual general co-operation meeting of all the churches in the state—that is, beside the county meetings there should also be an annual state meeting for the purpose of forming an acquaintance with one another—improving one another—acquiring a more intimate knowledge of the statistics of the whole state—and of the places and points that need effort, enterprize, or special co-operation to bring them under the operation of the gospel

system of culture—in one word, to take effectual measures to scatter the seed of the kingdom, and to plant churches all over the land to the utmost extent of all our resources.

It was observed that the brethren and churches of Ohio are by no means acquainted with one another, and that they ought to be, in order to enjoying and doing that amount of good awarded them in the kind dispensation of Heaven. The brethren in the state will please generally speak out on this important suggestion, and compare their views, and thus inquire into the expediency of having an annual, biennial, or triennial general meeting for the purposes above mentioned. It is good for us to be often and with one accord in one place, and to stir up one another to love and good works. How many churches—how many thousand Disciples of Christ are in Ohio? Some of us could tell more readily how many Disciples were in Judea in the year of Christ 40, than the number now in our own particular state or county.

The annual meeting of Trumbull county meets at Warren in 1840, at its usual time—i. e. on Friday before the last Lord's day in August: while the Medina and Cuyahoga annual meeting will be held at Euclid, Cuyahoga, on the Friday before the first Lord's day of September. These meetings commence at 2 o'clock P. M. A. C.

News from the Churches.

Euclid, Cuyahoga county, Ohio, June 25, 1839

As it is always pleasant to hear of the success of the primitive gospel. I take the liberty of forwarding you a sketch of a three days' meeting, held in Euclid, commencing on the 22d of the present month, attended by J. J. Moss and A. S. Hayden; during which time nine of the most respectable citizens were added to our congregation by being immersed into the death of our Lord, and raised with him to walk in newness of life; the consequence of which is that a very favorable impression has been made upon the minds of many. Doubtless there were many, like Agrippa, almost persuaded to be Christians, who I hope will soon be gathered into the fold of Christ. I have immersed five elsewhere since I last wrote you. W. O'CONNER.

Erwinton, South Carolina, July 22, 1839.

The truth is spreading in this section of country notwithstanding the most violent opposition. Some of the opposers resort to all kinds of means, fair und uninir, to arrest its progress; but their measures are of such a proscriptive character, and so unlike any thing that is Christian, that they generally aid the cause they would injure. The Baptist congregation, in whose meeting-house you advocated the truth, is giving us, by excision, some of their best and brightest members. Among the number brother William I. Green, their preacher, whom they have forbid to preach Christ; but as Peter and John, when they were forbid to preach in the name of Christ, still continued to proclaim the gospel, so brother Green continues to preach Jesus. They will therefore shortly cut him off and the minority of the congregation with him. In one congregation to whom brother G. preaches, the opposers have withdrawn, and left the brethren to continue their Christian course. In another there will be little or no opposition: the brethren there are willing to follow the truth as it is in Jesus, through evil as well as good report. Thank the Lord If we had one or two Ephraim A. Smiths to assist brother Green, it would turn out to the furtherance of the gospel very much

WILLIAM R. ERWIN.

Brunswick, Ohio, July 9, 1839.

If you have not already received the information, you can publish the following progress of reform. At the yearly meeting at Moradore there were twelve immersed; at the yearly meeting at Huntsburg, nine; at a three days' meeting at Morrison, commencing on the 22d of June, there were seventeen immersed; and at a meeting held at the same time in Euclid, nine; at Chardon, two; and on Sunday last, at Royalton, two; in all since the first of June, within my knowledge, fifty-one. J. J. MOSS.

Centreville, Bourbon county, Ky., July 23, 1839.

The gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ is still manifesting itself the power of God unto salvation to many in Kentucky who believe it; yea, to every such soul. I presume before this you have heard of the recent triumphs at South Elkhorn, Republican, and Nicholasville, in Fayette and Jessamine counties; at which places more than one hundred and twenty from the alien army rallied around the standard of Immanuel. Since then I was at Leesburg on the first Lord's day in July, with brothers Adams, William Parker, G. W. Williams and others. Some 23 came forward during the meeting. I was at Republican again on the 2d Lord's day inst. with brother Thomas Smith, when 13 confessed faith in the Lord. Brother Johnson was at the same time at Millersburg in this county. Before he left some 22 confessed the Lord. This last is the point at which our yearly meeting is to be held, commencing on Friday before the 2d Lord's day in September next. Oh! that you could favor us with your company there! Vast I expect will be the concourse from all quarters; and although violent opposition has raged just there, I think a better day is about to dawn on that part of our county. The impression left by your discourses in Kentucky, so far as I can see and hear, was unprecedented, and particularly favorable in Bourbon county. Do, then, come to the yearly meeting; thousands would flock to hear you, the weather favoring; and, rain or shine, we should be thronged. You could there have an opportunity of seeing most of the evangelists and many of the elders who labor in word and doctrine on the north side of the Kentucky river; and believing that you could effect much indeed through them in getting the churches of God in this section in more perfect order, I the more earnestly plead with you to come.

I neglected to mention the addition of some four, I think, when at Cane Ridge in this county, late in June, with brother Johnson and others.

July 24th. I this day attended a meeting just below Lee's Lick, in Harrison county.—At one effort we induced two nobly to step forward and confess the Lord, and two others came to ask the administration of immersion who had previously confessed. Feeble as I have been occasionally for years, I feel about as well as usual, and more determined than ever to preach the gospel of Christ until I die, the Lord willing and his grace attending.—May the good Lord smile on you and yours I humbly pray.

JOHN ALLEN GANO.

I am sorry that previous engagements and multiplied responsibilities at this time forbid my attendance with the brethren at their big meeting at Millersburg. I have no doubt but it would have been as much joy to me as it could possibly be to any of the beloved brethren and fellow-laborers in the kingdom of the Messiah with whom I would have communed on the occasion. But I have often to deny myself of such pleasures for the sake of more imperious claims upon my time. I hope to see many of these excellent spirits some time during the approaching Fall.—A. C.

Newbern, Virginia, June 19, 1839.

At a meeting of the Messengers of six congregations on last Monday, in Montgomery, Va., the following questions were answered in the affirmative:—

1. Do we need an assistant Evangelist? 2. Can we support one? 3d. Shall we do it? 4. Shall brothers John Coffee, Esq., C. Curtis, and C. Bullard serve as corresponding committee in obtaining one?

We are not acquainted with the proclaiming brethren, and although we would not be too nice, yet any one would not suit. This is not an unimportant field, situate on the great thoroughfare from the East to the West, proximate to the best watering places in Virginia, enjoying the most healthy air and water, with lands sufficiently productive. We not only have numerous visiters, but constant accessions from different sections to our permanent population; and all things considered, we think the old gospel has succeeded as well here as any place. Do you know of a brother of decent talents and undoubted devotedness to the cause, who could live on 150 or 200 dollars per annum, who would serve us? Will you help us to obtain one? Without the assistance of some one on whom we could rely, we might obtain one who would do us more hurt than good.*

I baptized 6 last Monday, and 7 on the Monday before.

CHESTER BULLARD.

Centreville, Indiana, June 27, 1839.

At the close of a campaign of about three months, I hasten to inform you of its result. On the 12th of April our beloved and zealous brother James M'Vey, of Belleville, in this state, commenced a protracted meeting in this place, during which *thirty-five* aliens were introduced into the kingdom of the Messiah, and ten that had been immersed were added by letter. A few weeks after the close of the above meeting, brother M'Vey having returned from an excursion into Ohio, we commenced another *big meeting*, during which about *sixty* more were baptized, and several added by letter. The total of those added to the congregation in this place is 112. It was indeed a glorious time, calculated to elicit the warmest gratitude towards our heavenly Father, from all who rejoice in witnessing the conquests of the gospel. It produced some opposition among our *professing neighbors*; but its point is becoming blunt. And you see, too, that the apprehensions of the solar sectarian, of whom I spoke in my last report to you, were verified. The warm weather came, and scores stepped into the water. May God bless all the consecrated brethren!

SAMUEL K. HOSHOUR.

* Who will go?—A. C.

Pulaski county, Kentucky, June 20, 1839.

I take up my pen to inform you of the progress of the glorious cause we plead. We are fast approaching to perfection in the simplicity of Christ's gospel in principle and practice; and O that the brethren every where would be reformers in principle and practice, and Christians indeed and in truth!

The congregation worshipping in Union Meeting-House has had numerous additions of late. At our last meeting there were six persons made the good confession that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God and Saviour of sinners. At the meeting there previous to the one just named there were ten more made the same confession and were immersed, four of whom were Methodists; so I think I am correct in stating that within one year there has been at least seventy-five substantial additions In the Somerset congregation there has been numerous additions: the precise number I do not know. Also, in Sardis congregation, some additions. So notwithstanding the slander and misrepresentation of our enemies, the cause of reformation is progressing.

There are two Baptist congregations known to me that act almost exactly upon the principles we contend for, with the exception of receiving members, which still they must take upon their experience, instead of upon faith and knowledge. Although they are now opposed by some of their own members, they have discarded all orders in council; and my own opinion is, that they will yet acknowledge and practise all we contend for.

WILLIAM G. SWINNEY.

Princeton, Bureau county, Illinois, July 18, 1839.

We have here a small congregation who meet on the first day of every week to commemorate the death and resurrection of our Lord and Saviour, and to exhort and edify each other. We have from time to time had a few additions, and we now number about 30.—We very much need an evangelist: one who is well qualified for the work could do much good; but I fear that we could not sustain one; for there are but few, if any of us, that have obeyed the apostolic injunction to owe no man any thing; and that fell demon the spirit of speculation has been among us spreading ruin and desolation in his path; but thanks be to God a better spirit is prevailing, and those who had cast off *fear* and *restrained prayer* are now calling upon the name of the Lord. The harvest seems nearly ripe and the laborers few in this region. That laborers may be sent forth is the prayer of your brother in the gospel.

DANIEL BRYANT.

Franklin county, Illinois, June 7, 1839.

Our little congregation keeps growing in number. A little over three years ago we numbered 20 The present number I cannot tell correctly; but suppose there are about 90. Some have come forward almost at every meeting lately and publicly made the good confession. Within the last season brother Elias B. Reed began to proclaim the word, and bids fair to be useful amongst us. Society in this quarter is improving very perceptably.

PHILIP MULKEY.

Georgetown, Kentucky, July 29, 1839.

I have just reached home from a siege of eight days at the Cave Spring, (near the residence of Edmund Waller,) where we gained 48 additions to the cause of truth, much to the gratification of the brethren and friends. We had with us, the greater part of the time, our talented, pious and zealous brethren Begg, Rogers, Brown, and Kendrick—the latter from Tennessee I returned by South Elkhorn, and met brother Fleming. We labored Saturday, Lord's day, and Monday morning, and obtained three more additions; making in all 51 during this trip.

J. T. JOHNSON.

P. S Brother John Rogers is an Agent for the College; and to the eternal honor of the brethren at Millersburg, they secured the payment of $1000 as a permanent fund for the institution.

J. T. J.

Tuscaloosa, Alabama, July 29, 1839.

Within four weeks eight have made the good confession here; among whom the beloved, and pious, and devoted brother Thompson, of the Presbyterian church, Editor of "The Alabamian," and prospects brighter than the sun-beams of the morning.

J. A. BUTLER.

Boon county, Missouri, September 4, 1839.

On the third Lord's day of August we had an interesting meeting in Columbia: seven were added to the congregation on that occasion. The Saturday following we commenced a three days' meeting at Bear Creek; there were eight who confessed and obeyed the Saviour and thirteen additions to the church at that place; and among them was one old brother who had been a Methodist for near 30 years, but a few days before had been buried with his Saviour in baptism; and one other from the Baptist ranks. At other intermediate appointments ten have confessed and obeyed the heavenly King in this vicinity. Brethren Wills, Woodson, Lee, J. Coons, and myself being the teaching brethren present on most occasions alluded to. Last Saturday and Lord's day I was at Fayette, without any one with me who spoke in public: five were added to that church during my stay with them. I understood that at a *big* meeting held at Dover, in Randolph county, on the second Lord's day in August there were sixteen additions. At a meeting which closed yesterday, near Millersburg, in Callaway county, I am told there were ten who obeyed the gospel. Appearances are still favorable for good. Brother Lancaster is expected to settle near Fayette in a few weeks, and expects to devote his time to the duties of an evangelist.

THOMAS M. ALLEN.

Morristown, Indiana. August 30, 1839.

The cause of our King is gloriously triumphing in this and the counties adjoining At a protracted meeting on Little Blue River, in Rush county, I attended in company with brethren M'Duffee, A. Miller and D. Holt. We immersed fifteen in process of the meeting: three united—two of them from the Baptists. This meeting commenced on Friday before the second Lord's day inst., and closed the third Lord's day evening. The prospects were good at the close Including the fourth Lord's day brother James M'Vay held a protracted meeting in Rush county, 3 miles east of Little Blue River: when twenty persons were immersed. On the same day, including the four Lord's days, I commenced a three days' meeting on Big Blue River, Hancock county, in company with brother Moneyhon: three came forward and made the good confession, two were immersed, and the prospects still good. We get a much more attentive hearing now in Indiana than we have ever had before. I believe we have gained the victory so far through the truth. The congregations appear to be awaking to their duty. May our heavenly Father, by his word and providence, bless every laudable effort in his good cause, and aid you in vanquishing every infidel in your way, and every haughty prelate, until the truth shall triumph from Bethany to the Rocky Mountains!

PETER H. ROBERTS.

Evergreen, South Carolina, July 13, 1839.

Since you left here our preachers have been busily engaged in proclaiming the word—with but little success; but the time is coming when we will reap, if we faint not. The young man you saw at my house the morning you left, has obeyed and is a zealous disciple. Brother Barnes has immersed some five or six at Greenville They now have at that place eleven in all, and are constituted a congregation, and meet together every Lord's day. Brother Barnes left here yesterday for Greenville, where he intends remaining two weeks. I hope much good will be done.

SAMUEL G. EARLE.

Charlestown, Indiana, September 5, 1839.

I take the liberty of informing you of a debate that took place in this town, commencing on Tuesday, the 27th of August, and continued four days and a half, between the Rev. Mr. Orr, a Presbyterian Minister of this place, and brother Newton Short, an Evangelist; in which brother Short acquitted himself with honor, and gave full satisfaction to the congregation who attended. The gospel gained a complete triumph; as an evidence of which brother Dr. Walters and brother Short commenced preaching on Saturday night, and continued until Wednesday night, which resulted in twenty two immersions, of as intelligent and respectable gentlemen and ladies as this place and vicinity afford, several of whom were Pedobaptists. A very favorable impression has been made on the public mind.

I will also inform you of a four days' meeting, embracing the fourth Lord's day in August, at Hibernia, in this county, attended by brethren S. Marshal, J. Hostuler, Ziba Brown, and myself Fifteen were added, nine of whom were immersed.

Also, a union was effected between the congregation of that place and the brethren of Olive Branch, once called Tunkers. The congregation numbers about 140. The truth will triumph.

M. COLE.

Florida, Missouri, August 28, 1838.

The gospel is gaining ground over the opinions of men in this country. On the 14th of July last I attended a meeting at Dover, in Randolph county, at which meeting sixteen made the good confession. On the 2d of August I attended a four days' meeting of the brethren in Fayette, Howard county, when we had the pleasure of seeing sixteen more obey that form of doctrine delivered by the Apostles. On the 8th of August I left Fayette for Dover, in Randolph county, where I delivered six discourses on the Christian religion; when nine owned Jesus as their Lord and Master and put him on. At this meeting some of the prominent members of the Baptist church declared they were convinced of the impropriety of sectarianism, and said they would unite with the Disciples. Two Methodists united with us.

The last discourse I delivered at this place was felt more than any other, and if I could have staid longer I have no donbt I would have seen many more buried with my Lord in immersion; but I have a family to support, which must be done by my own labor; and let the prospects be ever so good, we have to leave and go to the support of our families.

On the 18th of August we met with the citizens of Shelbyville and vicinity, where we planted a congregation of fifteen of as respectable disciples as I have seen in any country. A very favorable impression was left on the congregation at this place; but, as usual, I, with other brethren who attended the meeting, had to leave for home, having left home and went to this place, which is 30 miles, after 5 o'clock P. M., and returned home after meeting on the 18th, being the Lord's day. One was immersed at this meeting.

On the 25th instant we commenced a meeting which continued three days, in Santa Fee, 10 miles south of this place; where brother Lancaster delivered five discourses, which have, I think, effected much good in that vicinity.

If some of us could leave our homes, and live without the temporal things of this world, much good might be effected in this vicinity.

H. THOMAS.

Has not the Lord ordained that they who preach the gospel should live by the gospel? Will any one deny this decree, or say it must not now be obeyed. Awake, brethren, awake! Read Paul our Apostle, 1 Cor. 9th chapter; and when you pray that the word of the Lord may run and be glorified, do not muzzle the preacher nor tie him to the plough.

A. C.

Georgetown, Kentucky, September 4, 1839.

I have just returned home after a tour of three weeks. I spent five days at Mount Sterling, where many of the brethren had assembled at their annual meeting. We had thirty-three accessions up to that time I was compelled to leave for the annual meeting in Garrard county. Brother Buckner Payne informed me to-day in Lexington that they continued the meeting in Mount Sterling a few days longer, and the whole number obtained was forty-eight. I labored with the brethren in Garrard county for seven days, and we had forty additions. The prospects were still good; but we had to leave for a three days' appointment at Given's, in Lincoln county, within six miles of Danville. We obtained thirteen at that meeting. Brethren T Smith and E. A. Smith were with me at the Fork and at Given's. Brother Begg was present at the latter place. Brother T. Smith preaches at the former place, and brother Begg at the latter The prospects were most auspicious at the latter place. We could have obtained 50 or 100 more, in my judgment, if we could have remained. We then repaired to Harrodsburg as Trustees of the College. We met one of the patrons of the College returning home, who said we had convinced him. He made confession, and has resolved to obey.

I spoke at 3 o'clock and at night in Harrodsburg; and a young man from the Cumberland Presbyterians, who had been immersed, united with us. We had to leave yesterday morning. The College has commenced under highly favorable prospects.

We hope to see you in Kentucky before long. J. T. JOHNSON.

Georgetown, Kentucky, September 5, 1839

Did I inform you that a few weeks back I had left home on a preaching tour to Cynthiana. The same day, at night, a messenger arrived with news that our lovely little boy, 8 months old, had been seized with fits. I dashed for home—reached there just before 11 at night: but he had gone to the Lord. It was a severe blow; but I rejoice to know that he is safe with the Lord and freed from the vexations of this troublesome world. My wife was for a time overwhelmed with grief. I hope she has risen superior to it. He was our favorite litlie J. T. J. The Lord gives—the Lord takes away—blessed be the name of the Lord. J. T. JOHNSON.

How much consolation there is in believing the fact, that the offspring of the righteous —even their babes, are precious in the sight of the Lord; and that our Father and their Father, our God and their God, has infinitely more tenderness and affection for them than the most tender mother ever cherished for her most beloved child. With what cheerfulness, then, may we not resign them into the hand of so gracious a Father and benefactor!

A. C,

Chambersburg, Illinois, August 6, 1839.

An apology is due you for my long silence, as it is now near two years since you requested I should report progress; and when I tell you that my excuse for not writing is, that I had nothing to communicate, you will ask, What have you been doing? And I answer, Nothing. I will not trouble you with a recital of the causes of my inactivity; but, as you have learned from my fellow-laborer, brother Hatchitt, I have again taken the field; and, blessed be God, he does not doom me to labor in vain. Since brother Hatchett wrote you, we held a meeting at Columbus, Adams county, including the second Lord's day in July; during which five persons united with the congregation—three by immersion, and two by letter.

On Friday, the 26th July, we again visited Bear Creek, (the places mentioned by brother Hatchett,) and continued with them until the 1st instant; during which time sixteen united themselves with the congregation—twelve by immersion, and four by letter: prospects still good for many more. I will endeavor to write more frequently in future.

JOHN RIGDON.

Monroe county, Ohio, September 16, 1839

I went to the meeting at Antioch, where we had a cordial reconciliation of all matters, and a most joyful meeting. Among other matters of interest six were immersed.

Brethren Bottomfield, Milliner, and Dr. Crist attended at our big meeting. We had a joyful meeting—immersed fourteen—had an immense congregation from all the neighborhood round, whose minds were greatly freed from prejudice against the truth. We organized yesterday with twenty-eight members, and chose two elders and two deacons.

A. G. EWING.

Woodford county, Kentucky, August 20, 1839.

We held a protracted meeting at the Forks of Elkhorn, commencing on Friday before 3d Lord's day in July last. It continued four days. Twenty-one confessed the Lord We commenced Friday following at Grassy Spring, 3 miles from the former place, and continued 10 days: 75 confessed the Lord. Thence we went to S. Benson, 6 miles south of Frankfort: here we continued 8 days: 50 confessed the Lord, and 5 or 6 Baptists united with us. Br. A. Kendrick, of Tennessee, was the principal speaker. The church at the Forks numbers about 88, the Grassy Spring about 180; South Benson, about 100 May he truth triumph! WM. H. WHITTINGTON.

Dry Creek, Kentucky, August 9, 1839.

Brother Campbell—Your letter, dated in last month, has been received, and I now proceed to answer your inquiry.

There are in Campbell county four congregations of Disciples:—One at Republican school-house, (in my neighborhood,) numbering 52 members. This church was planted the 8th of October, 1828, and since that time there has been near 300 additions to it, and the reason of it now being reduced to 51 is in consequence of three churches being planted within 8 miles of it in the last eighteen months; myself and Alexander Dickey are the elders, and a great many members have moved off.

Second church, at Ludlow's, on the Ohio river, one mile below Covington, planted two years ago, and I am told that it numbers upwards of 40 members.

Third church, at New Ireland, planted in March last, with 12 members; and, if I am not mistaken, now numbers 20. They have no officers as yet. They meet the fourth Saturday in this month to select officers. I preach for them.

Fourth church, at the Bank Lick Seminary, planted in April last, with 8 members; and I am told that they now number something over 40. I and brother W. Scott preach for them. They have no officers as yet.

Besides these four churches there is in this county over 100 Disciples who are members of churches in Boone, Pendleton, and Grant counties.

The four churches I have named above have each a small house:—One brick, one frame, and two hewed log.

Since the first of June last I have baptized 50 persons—24 of them in my own neighborhood. JOHN G. ELLIS.

Lexington, Kentucky, September 6, 1839.

We have just had a most interesting meeting in our city, conducted by brother R. C. Ricketts, of Mason county, aided a part of the time by brother A. Kendrick, from Tennessee. The meeting continued ten days. Our meeting-house was generally crowded, and always full. Many of the different denominations were generally in attendance, and heard with apparent interest. Much prejudice was removed, and misunderstanding of our sentiments corrected. There were, during the meeting, twenty-five accessions made to the cause of Christ—twenty-two by confession and immersion—*one* from the Baptists, and *two* from other congregations. The cause is advancing gloriously in this country, as far as *proselyting* is concerned. B. F. HALL.

A motion has been made, and seconded by many voices, that we do not, unless duty require it, say any thing about the piety, talent, eloquence of brethren. Therefore I have stripped the above names of some epithets, to which, no doubt, in the judgment of brother Hall and many others, they are entitled to. A full apology for this hereafter. A. C.

Troy, Pennsylvania, August 20, 1839.

I wish to invite some prominent brother in each congregation of Disciples in the United States, to furnish the readers of the Harbinger with something like the following, from the congregation to which he belongs:—

THE CONGREGATION IN TROY, BRADFORD COUNTY, PA.
Number of Disciples, ... 72

CONGREGATION IN GRANVILLE, BRADFORD COUNTY, PA.
Number of Disciples, ... 99

I have returned to my former place of residence, and have been proclaiming the good news in this region since the first of March last; during which time there have been 42 added to the Disciples. The "news from the churches," published in the Harbinger, is unspeakably gratifying to me. May God bless our successful brother Johnson, and all who are engaged in the reformation of the people of this generation!

S. E. SHEPARD.

Lexington, Kentucky, August 22, 1839.

Last evening I returned from a six days' meeting at Versailles. A young and talented brother, A. Kendrick, from Tennessee, and myself did the preaching. Forty-two joined themselves to the brethren during the meeting; some from the Baptists and Methodists; one intelligent lady from the Episcopalians, a sister of two preachers of that order; but the most of them from the world. Among the number, and the pioneer, was your venerable friend, Col. Blackburn. As soon as the invitation was given by brother Kendrick, at the close of his discourse, on Lord's day morning, Col. Blackburn started forward from the extreme part of the house. He came pressing through a dense crowd, and as soon as he was perceived by his excellent and pious daughter, sister Bartlett, she flew to meet him; and oh! what a scene. The Col. asked permission to speak to the congregation. His address was affectionate and impressive. He has been a lawyer, I think, about 40 years, and 27 a politician; during which time he has served in the state legislature and senate. He told his friends that he had, during that time, served them to the best of his ability; but lamented that he had not served his God. He exhorted old and young to embark immediately in the service of the Lord, and go with him to heaven. During his impassioned address, nearly the whole of a vast congregation appeared to feel deeply; and I am astonished that there was a tearless eye in the assembly. The day after his immersion he said he had already enjoyed more happiness than he had experienced in all his life before, and that his joys were still increasing. I staid with him two nights, and was awakened both mornings by his singing the songs of Zion. He told me that he generally arose in time to see the stars in the morning.

Last week we had a protracted meeting at Mt. Zion, about 14 miles from this. Sixteen became obedient to the faith. Brethren A. Raines, Wm. Hunter, J. Creath, Jr., and myself were the teachers.

At the same time of our meeting at Versailles, the two brethren Creaths held a meeting at Providence, 6 miles from here. Fifteen were immersed there. The gospel has achieved greater conquests this summer in Kentucky, than at any previous period. All we need, with the blessing of God, is efficient preachers to convert the people, and pastors to take care of them, and for the churches to sustain the preachers.

B. F. HALL.

☞ I thank brethren Fleming, Poindexter, and others, for the statistics they have already furnished. We cannot now find room for them. We want to have them arranged according to counties as much as possible.

A. C.

CHRISTIANS AMONG THE SECTS.—No. VII.

POSITIVE ORDINANCES.

I again repeat what has been so often reiterated in these essays, that in religion the state of the *heart* is "all in all." "But the heart is *deceitful* above all things, and desperately wicked. Who can know it?" It is immediately subjoined, "I the Lord search the heart, I try the reins, to give to every man according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings." But not only does our divine Father know all the secret workings of the human heart, but He has graciously condescended to give us the means of knowing our *own* hearts.

Without the word and ordinances of the Lord, we might well exclaim with the Psalmist, "Who can understand his errors?" But *with* these we may fully obey the apostolic injunction, "Examine yourselves, prove yourselves whether you are in the faith." In the sacred word all the secret springs of human action are disclosed. There, it is, that the whole mind is dissected, and laid open to its own view. As the victims at the altar, when slain, were laid upon the back, and exposed to the view of the priest, and dissected joint by joint, so is the human mind laid open and dissected in the word of the Lord. As the instrument of the priest separated between those parts of the sin-offering which were to be burned upon the altar, and those parts which were to be burned *without* the camp, so does that divine instrument, "the sword of the Spirit," separate between those thoughts and affections which are animal and sensual, and those which are spiritual and divine. So sharp is the point, and so keen the edge of that heavenly blade, that with the utmost precision, and, at the same time, with unerring certainty, it separates the spiritual from the animal desires of the soul. "The word of God is living and effectual, sharper than any two edged sword, extending to the separation of *soul* and *spirit*—of the joints and marrow; and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." But how such power, and such discrimination could be imparted to revealed truth, would have been an overwhelming mystery to all, had not the Apostle himself explained that all things, even the profoundest secrets of the human heart, were spread out like a map or chart to the view of the author. "And there is no creature concealed from his sight; for all things are naked and open to the eyes of him to whom we must give account." But the divine ordinances are a part of this revealed truth, and have the same heart-searching tendency. They are given "for our sakes," that we may know the state of our own hearts; they are given as a ground of assurance, and also as a means of preserving the heart in that state, which alone can constitute any man an acceptable worshipper of God.

Without further preface we at once come to the consideration of the first positive ordinance given to man, viz: The prohibition of the fruit of "the tree of knowledge of good and evil." Every one who reads the history of the first man, and who knows any thing of the constitution of the human mind, will see at once that a *sensible* test of loyalty was *essential* to the happiness of even the first man. Who does not see that numberless occasions of doubt and inquietude would have arisen without such a test? Who, that has known the bliss of friendship, but knows that the mind ever active—the imagination ever on the wing,

is always ready to inflict self-torture upon the occurrence of any thing out of the usual felicitous train? An unusual absence—an air of disregard—the slightest coldness of expression—or a look of indifference, will awaken the chords of memory, and call forth the inquiry, with the most intense interest, "What have I done?" "What ingratitude, or baseness, or unworthiness has my friend, the beloved of my heart, seen in me?" Thus had it been with our first parents, even in Eden's garden, had not our Creator given them a *sensible* test. While they regarded the prohibition, they were *assured* of the divine favor, and consequently happy. Who does not also see that the overt act of plucking and eating the prohibited fruit, was but the *consummation* simply of a proof which began in *heart*? It began in *unbelief* of God's word. The voice of the tempter is regarded as an oracle of truth and wisdom. "He boldly called the *truth* of God a *lie*." The lie was believed—the affections are, for the time being, alienated from the fountain of being and blessedness—the *heart* is turned away from the Lord.

We are, then, to look far beyond the overt act; we are to trace it to its corruption in the heart; and in that stage of its existence, we find it to be *unbelief!!* The prohibition is thus at once divested of its unmeaning and arbitrary character; and assumes a moral, a rational, a religious aspect! Who cannot understand the perfect rationality of the declaration, that "Without faith it is impossible to please God?" Men are sometimes greatly offended at this doctrine. They think it very hard to be told that all their deeds of mercy and goodness to their fellow creatures will be utterly contemned by the Most High, unless they flow from the principle of faith! But they would understand the subject better, and would see its rationality, if they would apply it to themselves. Let us then read the sentence, Without faith it is impossible to please man! and it will be found equally true. What man would feel himself *pleased* or *honored* by any act of obedience or submission, extorted from another, while he knew that the person so obeying had no faith in him as a man of truth, neither had any love for his person or character?

Thus we come to consider the penalty, "For in the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die;" or as the Septuagint reads, "Dying thou shalt die." And who cannot see that in the *nature* and *fitness* of things, death was, and is still, the true and proper penalty for every transgression? A created being, from the nature of the case, can do no more than his *duty*. He owes his all to the being that gave him existence. He has no right to the control of his own powers. He must yield the entire control of those to the sovereign power that called them forth. If he refuse to do this, could we conceive of any other penalty than the surrender of those powers, or the *enjoyment* of which the being was made capable by those powers; and *death* is but the privation of enjoyment. But was the penalty literally inflicted on our first parents? The penalty *was inflicted the very day* of the transgression; but as in the case of Isaac, a substitute is found. The life's blood of innocent victims is poured out at the foot of an altar, reared for the purpose, and the punishment being thus transferred, the *life* of Adam is saved, and his guilt removed by *forgiveness*, by which alone it can be removed; as in its very nature it can never be transferred. If a part of this should be deemed a novel and bold speculation, I have only to say to the reader "Have patience and I will pay thee all." CHRISTIANOS.

The English sword first—the English policies second—the English sciences and arts third—the English school-masters fourth—the English clergy fifth—and the English catechisms sixth, constitute a plausible solution of this strange problem:—

SINGULAR MOVEMENT IN BENGAL.

The world seems really to be turned upside down now-a-days. Old things are becoming new with incredible celebrity. Every foreign arrival brings us something to wonder at, till at length we have ceased to wonder at all. We have ceased also to believe and to disbelieve. Nothing surprises us; but we take things as they come, and wait patiently for confirmation or contradiction, as the case may be; it seems quite a matter of indifference or chance to us how it turns out. So much for living in these days of the world's renovation, and especially in this focus of all human or inhuman excitement, the United States of America. The last great story which we honored with our usual editorial attention, and no more, came out in the religious papers a week or two since—being news brought by a late steamer [as usual.] It related to a strange revolution said to have occurred among the Hindoos, near Alshnaghur, one of the stations of the Church Missionary Society, about 70 miles north of Calcutta. It was stated that in 55 villages, extending for sixty miles along the Jehngha, *more than three thousand Hindoos* had thrown away their idols within a few months, and expressed a desire to be admitted into the Christian church; a movement for which the day of Pentecost itself would apparently furnish the only precedent we have.

What is more strange, however, this rumor would seem to be true. The confirmations of it are too strong to be gainsayed or denied. We have the regular reports of the Rev. Archdeacon Dealtay of the church, a personage of the highest repute, who visited the villages at the request of the Lord Bishop (Wilson) of Calcutta, for the purpose of learning the truth On ascertaining this, the Bishop himself entered with his whole soul into the matter, and wrote to London, to the directors of the Church Missionary Society, urging the sending of between thirty and forty additional clergymen, school-masters, and catechists, into this field. He says, "If we can but enter at the *wide and effectual door* in time, not only these 3000 or 4000, but the whole population of the fifty or sixty villages may receive the Christian faith, and resemble our Christian villages in the times of our Anglo-Saxon forefathers in the 6th and 7th centuries. Such a glorious scene has never yet been presented to our longing eyes in Bengal!"

All this, with a long elaborate letter, full of details, is addressed to the Earl of Chichester, President of the Church Missionary Society, and appears to have created in England a strong sensation. The Bishop appeals very forcibly to the Universities for aid. He says he shall make a tour of confirmation in the autumn, to the extent of 3000 miles, with the view of visiting the new Christians. Some attempts are made to explain the origin of this great movement; but it seems to us, at this distance, that they must be accounted for by other than proximate causes. Powerful influences, tending to such results, have long

been at work in the East, especially under British sway. Missionary influence is one of these, but only one. Those who would have a more extended view of them all must consult many authorities. They must study the whole history of British India. Mr. Malcom, in his travels, throws much light on the subject. He anticipates that Boodhism will at no very remote period be generally abandoned, silently and slowly overgrown, as it were, by European civilization and the Christian religion. [*Boston Transcript.*]

I should like to have the experiment of *thirty* clergymen, *thirty* school-masters, and *thirty* catechists to carry on the work of christianizing fifty villages. The Bishop calls to the *Universities* for aid, and proposes to make a long tour of *confirmation*. I have no doubt that such converts need the lights of the Universities, and the confirmation of Lord Bishops, to keep them in the pale of Queen Victoria's church.

A. C.

OUR NAME.

A COMMUNICATION from brother Cole, of Wilmington, is received. His overture is, that the title, *Christian Disciples*, has paramount claims. His communication containing his reasons, shall appear in our next.

An objection strongly urged, not by brother Cole, but by another brother, against the title, "*Disciples of Christ*," or its substitute, "*Disciples*," is, that it is a *common*, not a *proper* noun—that it is not even a *patronymic*. It is, on the other hand, argued that Christian is a *patronymic*—a name derived from a father or a founder—Christ; and that, therefore, *Christian* is the proper and patronymic name, which, above all others, has superior claims.

Well, if so, we must have better logic than I have yet seen to prove it: for the above argument is all on the side which it opposes. It is decidedly against its author. *Christian* is not a patronymic—*Christ* is not a proper name. "His name shall be called Jesus," said the angel. That is a proper name, whose patronymic is *Jesuit*. Christ is the name of an office—it is equal to *King* or *Priest;* and that I have no doubt is the true reason why the original disciples of Christ would not, could not, *did not* accept the name from the Antiochans, nor from the magistrates, nor even from King Agrippa, who, not knowing the meaning of *Christos*, supposed it to be a proper name, and *Christian* to be its patronymic. For the first disciples of Christ to have called themselves 'The Anointed,' would have been a singular proper name. They were too discriminating for such a mistake. Our brother's logic proves that we ought to be called *Jesuits*. If it does not prove this, I affirm in my judgment it proves nothing. But if any one say that we can make the common noun *Christian* a proper noun, then I say we may make the word *Disciple* a proper name—nay, it is done in the New Testament, and by high authority. I am glad this subject is before us. I have heard much said in behalf of the name *Christian* for thirty years; and I am only more and more persuaded that the Apostles had better reasons for not assuming it, than any living man can give for now wearing it!

Jesus, among the Jews, was a proper name, and *Christ* a characteristic—an official designation. *Jesuits* or *Disciples of Christ* is now the alternative. Brethren, take your choice. A. C.

AN IRRESPONSIBLE PREACHER.

In reply to interrogations from brother Gilbert T. Hasney, bishop of a congregation in Montgomery county, Indiana, concerning the standing of one J. Secrest, formerly from the vicinity of Medina, Stark county, Ohio, now located in his vicinity of Greencastle, Putnam county, Ia., and touching a pamphlet written in his defence—I am in duty bound to state, that the said J. Secrest left his own county, and the brethren to whom he formerly ministered, with a bankrupt reputation for moral character—was tried and convicted of immoral conduct by a very large and respectable community in his own immediate vicinity before he left, and it is believed that if he have any recommendations with him of good standing, he obtained them in a dishonorable way. Those who wish for particular information touching his standing, may apply to Elder John Whitacre, of Minerva, long known as his devoted friend—than whom no man's testimony, in that county, is more worthy of credit. He is in possession of the particulars of said trial and conviction, living just in his own neighborhood: I am not.

A certain pamphlet, whitewashing this frail preacher, and insinuating that my former notice of him grew out of his refusal to be Agent forme; and that he refused to be Agent for me because I would not write against slavery; and that I acknowledged to certain members of a committee that I had nothing else against him but said refusal, &c. &c., was forwarded to me some time since. It is self-condemnatory—a tissue of falsehoods and misrepresentations—and wholly beneath notice. All the whitewashers in Ohio can never give to the hero of that tale a fair reputation now. Unhappy man! He is a disgrace to the Christian profession. For particulars inquire of Elder John Whitacre, Minerva, and Harrison Jones, of Wooster, who are intimately acquainted with his standing and character in Ohio. A. C.

TO THE BRETHREN IN MISSISSIPPI.

Dear Brethren—

I HAVE succeeded, according to my promise to you, in obtaining a brother of good standing and of ability to do the work of an evangelist among you. I am not, indeed, personally acquainted with brother Carey Smith, now of Ohio, who has consented to remove with his family among you; but I have ascertained from various respectable sources his credible, intellectual, moral, and religious character; and I have no hesitation in recommending him to the brotherhood in Grand Gulf, Fort Gibson, Natchez, Consolation, Woodville, and their vicinities, as worthy of their patronage. Brother Smith did, while a Baptist minister, itinerate in South Carolina and other southern regions, and is well acquainted with southern manners, customs, &c. I think he ought to locate not far from Consolation or Woodville, and cultivate that region well, and make excursions to other points. He will devote, he has indeed devoted himself to the Lord and the brethren, and will give him-

self wholly to the work. The brethren will, no doubt, discharge their duty faithfully to him. I stand pledged for them. If on a fair trial you think, brethren, you ought to have another evangelist, and can sustain him, please inform me. I will endeavor to obtain another. I will not recommend to you one that will not, in my judgment, deserve your cordial support. You need help—we sympathize with you. May the Lord bless you all, and the labors of our beloved brother Smith among you! You may expect him about the middle of November. A. C.

BACON COLLEGE.

The next session of this institution will commence on the first Monday of September next, in Harrodsburg, in which place BACON COLLEGE has been permanently located by the trustees.

FACULTY.—SAMUEL HATCH, M. D.* Acting President, and Professor of Natural and Moral Philosophy, and Chemistry. SAMUEL G. MULLINS, Professor of Ancient Languages and Literature. H. H. WHITE, Professor of Mathematics and Civil Engineering. J. TUCK, Principal of Preparatary Department. The Preparatory Department will be conducted by an eminent teacher, and an assistent will be added to this department, if the number of pupils should require it.

The present healthy and delightful location of this college, with the exertions of its friends to place it upon high and elevated ground as a literary institution; and who, by voluntary subscription, have recently increased its funds to a sum over 50,000 dollars, will, we trust, enable it to deserve, and command an increased share of public patronage.

Strict attention will be given to the moral as well as the mental training of the members of this institution, and the course of instruction will be as complete as in the first colleges of the United States.

A large and commodious house, in a pleasant and retired situation, with ample ground, has been purchased by the trustees for the temperary accommodation of the college, and every arrangement made for the comfortable accommodation of the students. A building for the Preparatory Department has been commenced, and will be completed in a few weeks; and a college building for all the departments of the college proper, with a chapel, will be commenced forthwith, which will be constructed after the best model that can be procured in this country.

Boarding in genteel families in Harrodsburg and its vicinity, can be obtained for a large number of students, at from two to three dollars per week.

JAMES TAYLOR, J. P. WILLIAMS, BENJ. C. ALLIN, *Executive Committee.* C. L. JONES, C. J. SMITH, W. HATCH.

Harrodsburg, August 12th, 1839.

OWEN DEBATE.—In reply to our call, made a few months since for copies of the Owen Debate, we have got but a very few; and in obedience to many calls upon us, we intend to condense and more methodically arrange the arguments for the truth of the Christian Religion, in a work about half the size of said Debate. A new edition of the work has recently issued from the English press. A. C.

☞ Brother Shannon's Essays on *Ordination* shall appear in the next number of the Harbinger. His No. I. in our next.

* This chair will be filled as soon as a suitable person can be selected.

HARBINGER---EXTRA---*NUMBER XI.*

Bethany, Va. October, 1839.

A REVIEW OF A REVIEW OF SOMETHING CALLED "CAMPBELLISM."

Published in the January and April numbers of the American Biblical Repository.

The article is labelled by its author as follows.—"CAMPBELLISM BY REV. R. W. LANDIS, JEFFERSONVILLE, PA."

"Our country is full of pretended reformers, who never read the Bible, and who, animated by a blind impulse, vainly imagine they are turning the world upside down, while, in fact, they are only turning upside down in the world."—CLOUGH'S DISCOURSES.

This Review, divided into two parts, fills almost 70 octavo pages, and is endorsed by the Rev. Absalom Peters, D. D., in the words following, to wit:— *No. 1, p. 130.*

"NOTE.—We regret that our limits will not allow us to conclude this article in the present No. of the Repository. In the remaining sections, the author presents a brief synopsis of direct arguments against Campbellism, considers, at some length, the Unitarianism of the system, and reviews with much point, and in a very satisfactory manner, the *Translation of the New Testament* adopted by the Campbellites, showing it to be a gross deception practised upon the public. His arguments are characteristically biblical, and the article, as a whole, appears to us highly valuable and appropriate at the present time, as an able and learned refutation of the scheme of a pretender, whose popularity in some parts of our country has given him the power of destroying much good. The reader will also perceive that the strong language of disapprobation used by Mr. Landis, is fully justified by the facts in the case. The conclusion will appear in the Repository for April next."—EDITOR.

In reviewing my Reverend Reviewer, I can find a cheap and suitable motto in his own, by a very plausible emendation or two:—

'Our country is full of pretended Reviewers, who have never read with either candor or care, the works which they review; and who, animated by the spirit of the party to which they have attached themselves, vainly imagine they are exposing the errors and sophistry of those whom they review; while, in fact, they are only exposing their own ignorance, prejudice, and recklessness of truth."

Clough's wisdom amended and improved.

When truth or character is at stake, we ask no favors from friend or foe. We demand investigation. We challenge criticism—fair, honorable, impartial criticism. We fear not the tribunals, nor the canons, nor the decisions of enlightened, high-minded, honest criticism, however severe; but the petulant cavils of saucy sectarism, the accrimonious quibblings of cynical piquancy, the mawkish disdain of affected sanctity, and the supercilious denunciations of wounded pride—of *ex cathedra*, swollen, pampered orthodoxy, I can not endure; especially when it constitutes itself court, and jury, and witness, and hastens to pronounce sentence without privilege of a reply, or of an appeal. *

* I have written twice to Absalom Peters, D. D., and waited two months for an answer on the simple question, Will my defence be laid before his readers? to which he has vouchsafed no reply.

I am sorry that there is so much in the article before me to call up such unpleasant associations of ideas, and to demonstrate that Tetzel, to say the least, was as well qualified, and as impartially prepared to review Lutheranism, and Luther's version of the Bible, as the aforesaid Rev. R. W. Landis, of Jeffersonville, Pa. is to do either myself, or any thing I have written, justice before the public. Few of my readers may perhaps remember that this same Rev. R. W. Landis, who has so graciously undertaken the office of my reviewer, is that identical Mr. Landis, whose profound criticisms on the Greek of Acts xxii. 16; and admirable exegetical labors, together with his *remarkable disingenuousness in attempting to impose a palpable delusion on all unlearned readers, of his dissertations on self-baptism*, called for a brief, but thorough exposition from me, in the 6th volume Millennial Harbinger, pp. 168—169. By turning over to those pages the impartial inquirer will see how this very erudite and honorable scolar, critic and divine fared in my hands, while attempting to make the readers of the ephemeral "Christian Gazette," of Philadelphia, believe that Ananias commanded Paul "to *be* baptized," and to "*wash away his sins*," in different voices. The one command, said he, is active, the other passive; while, in fact, in Greek they are both in the same voice. From this eminent display of critical shrewdness and Christian honesty, my readers will not be astonished, either at his admirable qualifications for a literary reviewer, nor at the zeal with which he undertakes my condemnation.

Judges of law rarely or ever sit on the tribunals of justice, in cases in which they have only been employed in counsel; much less in those in which they are, or have been a party. But the clerical nerves of my pious reviewer are not so morbidly sensitive as those of the lawyers. He can oppose my views in the "*Christian Gazette*" in a personal controversy with myself, and when driven from the bar he ascends the bench, and in the *American* Biblical Repository, as from a literary and ecclesiastic tribunal, proceeds to pronounce an *ex cathedra* sentence upon his quondam antagonist, as though he were canonically appointed to decide, as sovereign arbiter of my doctrine, writings, and manner of life.

When seated on this literary throne, he cannot wait to quote any of my premises or conclusions, or to examine any of my positions, before he condemns me as an errorist. No, that would be a process too tedious for the inward burnings of his zeal. But most unfortunate for my reputation, with all who are doomed never to hear me, but to listen exclusively to my judge, who pronounces me an "errorist, having no more valid claims to be Christian than the Mormons,"—and proves

that "error in religion" in my case, as in all others, "arises from depravity of heart." He avows that "my views are essentially another gospel," and still worse, he more emphatically implicates my moral standing:—"We venture to affirm," says he, "that the course which Mr. Campbell has pursued in relation to his pretended translation of the New Testament, has been such as cannot fail to fill every one with the deepest horror, who will favor our remarks with a perusal." What need have they of farther witness who believe in Mr. Landis!

But as if all this was not enough to aggravate my doom, in the very commencement of his review he affirms some half dozen of palpable falsehoods concerning my early history, emigration to this country, embarrassed circumstances, connexion with the Baptists, &c. &c.; matters too, which he must have known to be false, had he read the works which he professes to review. My exposure and refutation of that most infamous libel of my sentiments, got up by one Jennings of Pittsburgh, under the pretence of its being the posthumous production of Dr. Obadiah Jennings of Nashville, in volume 3d of the old series of this work was before him, and other public documents in the Christian Baptist, from which he might have known the truth of these matters.

Had my impartial and benevolent reviewer delayed his fulminations till he had stated some premises from my writings, and given me even the mockery of an apparent hearing and refutation on my own words and actions, he might have been regarded as less indecorous and malignant; but to have preambled his review with such a phalanx of ungrounded assertions, unmanly imputations, and viperous calumnies, not only evinces him to be wanting of every primary attribute of an impartial reviewer, and more eminently qualified to abuse than to convince; but also, furnishes a very striking proof of one of his own favorite apothegms, viz:—"Error in religion, is, to say the least, much more the result of depravity of heart, than of honest and conscientious mistake." Now if this be true as respects *error in theory*, how much more in regard to error in practice! What then will this censorious world say of one who so wantonly errs from that candor and benevolence which have ever been regarded as most prominent attributes of Christian character!

Still I cannot but be thankful for the timous display of his acrimony, sinister feeling, and prejudice. Should any of his readers ever see my review they, in common with mine, cannot but doubt his utter incompetence to do me justice, nor good will to prove me erroneous in theory, and immoral in practice. His failure in the end cannot now be imputed, either to want of determination, or to lack of zeal in the cause of

defamation. We shall, then, with all calmness and self-possession, proceed to the examination of this monstrous thing called Campbellism, and endeavor to consider its most obnoxious features from one whose determination to make them manifest cannot reasonably be doubted.

Our reviewer is somewhat methodical, and heads his first section—"The fundamental principles of Campbellism pointed out and examined." "The fundamental principles" of this monstrous thing! What can they be! Alas! says Mr. Landis, there is no finding them out; for "the Campbellites keep their own sentiments concealed, either by not declaring them openly, or by the employment of a phraseology so ambiguous, that few can be found aside from their own denomination, who can give a rational account of even a few of the distinctive features of the system."* Amongst this elect few Mr. Landis is indeed one. To him it is a great consolation that "of late years, however, Mr. Campbell himself has become somewhat more emboldened in the advancement of his views. Backed, as he is, by a numerous host of followers, he no longer feels that restraint which formerly held him in check, and prevented his coming fearlessly before the public with his system in a tangible form."† Surely every one acquainted with our controversy, will here pause and smile at the qualifications of our reviewer; if at such temerity and ignorance he can smile. The very opposite to this statement is the fact, as every one but Mr. Landis knows. The most obnoxious volume I ever wrote was the 1st volume of the Christian Baptist, 1823. The universal sentiment or opinion among all parties is, that we are annually becoming more orthodox, and that one or two points excepted, all good Protestants could most cordially embrace us in the arms of their communion. I do not say that this is a just view of the present state of the controversy; but certainly it is now affirmed very generally through the length and breadth of the land to be a true statement of the matter. Like the passengers in a ship approaching the land, to whom the land appears as though it approached them, some of our friends say we are fast coming over to their views, or returning to the paths of orthodoxy. But Mr. Landis, no doubt, from his own careful examination of my writings, frankly owns, "that any one who has the requisite patience to wade through his (my) tomes, may reasonably entertain the prospect of ultimately detecting his (my) sentiments." Mr. L. has searched out the matter. We shall then hear him on the 1st and most fundamental principle of Campbellism—viz. FAITH.

"In Mr. C.'s narrative," says he, "of the debate between him and

* Page 99. † Page 99.

the late Mr. Jennings, of Nashville, he asserts that "faith, ranked among the fruits of the Spirit, is fidelity. Millennial Harbinger Extra, No. 1."* This is my first and fundamental error—the most fundamental of "the principles of Campbellism." We do indeed plead guilty to this charge. It is a true bill. *Faith* in Gal. v. 22, as in Matth. xxiii. 23, and Titus ii. 10, ought to be translated "*fidelity*." The word is the same in these three passages, viz. *pistis*. "The weightier matters of the law are righteousness, temperance, *fidelity*." Matth. xxii. 23. "The fruits of the Spirit are goodness, *fidelity*, meekness, temperance," and "shewing all good *fidelity* to their masters." Titus ii. 10. The King's version has *fidelity* in the last, and *faith* in the former two. Now it so happens that this radical error of Campbellism has been adopted by the good Presbyterian continuators of Matthew Henry's commentary. It is also the new version of Dr. McKnight. That faith frequently denotes fidelity, we have also the testimony of Parkhurst, Greenfield, Campbell—even the King's translators themselves, who so render it Titus ii. 10. The American and English Episcopalians are, with many Presbyterian Doctors, guilty of this fundamental sin of Campbellism; for with D'Oyly and Mants, they place fidelity for faith among the fruits of the Spirit, Gal. v. 22. Yes, and I fearlessly appeal to the Andover School itself, that I am right in translating *pistis fidelity* in Matth. xxiii. 23, and in Gal. v. 22, according to all their canons of interpretation. This fundamental error of Campbellism is indeed the common error of *ninety-nine hundredths* of the most learned and intelligent Christians on earth. But might not common sense itself perceive, that when Jesus associates righteousness and temperance with *faith* and calls them "the weightier matters of the law," he means not a mere principle, but a moral virtue! And when Paul associates faith, in the passage in debate, with "goodness, meekness, and temperance," against which there is no law, he means not a mere favor bestowed, but a moral virtue, sister to meekness and temperance!

But to the 2d proof of the fundamental error of Campbellism. It is, in these words:

"His fundamental position in relation to the faith which the gospel requires, or that belief which is to the saving of the soul, is, that it is, "*in its nature purely historical*, consisting in the belief of a few simple facts, and not doctrines; that there neither was, nor could there possibly be any difference between that belief of the gospel which is requisite to the salvation of the soul, and that credence, which we usually with readiness yield to any other well authenticated history." Vide *Debate*, pp. 32—33, etc. ut supra."

* Instead of M. H. Extra, No. I. it is 5, and vol. 3, page 110.

Did you know, Dr. Peters, that this is an unmanly, an unchristian attempt to impose upon your readers the words of a weak and prejudiced opponent as though they were mine? Positively, to all who will examine it, it must appear a most jesuitical attempt. Observe the manœuvre: Mr. Landis in the preceding period quotes from my narrative of "*the Debate*" with Mr. Jennings; and, without intimating to his readers, he quotes the next period from Mr. Jennings, and says to the reader, "*Vide Debate*, pp. 32, 33, *etc. ut supra*"—thereby deluding him into the belief that these are my words; whereas, in fact, they are the words of my antagonist!! Thus the reader is ingeniously imposed on, and words put into my mouth which I never uttered, and which cannot be found in any of my writings! My answer to this proof of error, and to the illustration which follows, is simply that they are not my words nor my views, but those of a weak and prejudiced opponent. Could not Mr. Landis, in all my volumes, as he intimates he had patience to examine them—I say, could he not find whereof to accuse me of error in my own words, without jesuitically putting into my mouth the words of an opponent!

But in the third place he quotes the Christian Baptist, vol. iii. No. 7; the substance of which he gives in the following words:—"Mr. Campbell asserts that to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, is to believe on him to the saving of the soul." "It is not possible," says he, "to misunderstand this." Very good: what does it mean? Let an Apostle pronounce sentence on these words. John the Apostle affirms, "*Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ* (the Messiah) IS BORN OF God." Surely, then, he has true faith! But he does not say that 'every one who *thinks* he believes, nor 'every one that *professes to believe*;' but "every one that *does believe* that Jesus is the Messiah is begotten, or born of God."

Again, in the same epistle, chap. v., John affirms that "this is the victory that overcomes the world, even our faith;" and in the next verse defines this faith, saying, "Who is he that overcomes the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" Surely, then, John was a Campbellite! and his first general epistle genuine Campbellism!! I neither affirm more nor less than the above on the subject of faith; but I am willing to explain myself fully, as I have often done on this subject. Mr. Landis has not, then, done me justice even in saying that "Mr. Campbell asserts that to believe that Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God, is to believe on him to the saving of the soul." He is too gross and undiscriminating a reader of the Bible, and of my works, ever to be depended on in his quotations or comments. Had he examined my writings carefully he would have found

me make this distinction—To believe a person, and to believe on him, are not always identical propositions. The one is often the cause—the other the effect. One must believe Jesus, before he can believe on him. I may sometimes believe Mr. Landis, but I am certain I do not believe *on* him, nor *in* him. I have no confidence in him. The demons believed Jesus, but did not believe on him. They could not believe on him, for he did not profess to be their Saviour. They could believe him; but they could not, therefore, believe on him. Sinners, however, amongst us, who do believe all that Jesus says to them, will, I rejoice to say, most certainly believe on him.

Mr. Landis may be of those who have too much faith to believe the gospel, or to believe Jesus. I know some persons who believe a great deal too much. They believe a thousand things about religion, and yet do not believe—nay, indeed, they do not understand the proposition that *Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God;* and therefore I am sure they cannot believe it. I reason about faith as I do about every thing else. Faith is something. It is an *effect:* it must have a *cause.* But the cause is one thing, and the effect another. Faith is the belief of testimony; but it is first belief in the testifier. I must believe the witness to be a man of veracity, or I cannot believe his testimony. Now the special faith of the New Institution is *belief in the testimony of Jesus concerning himself;* or it is the belief of the testimony of the witnesses concerning him: the consummation of which is *belief, faith, or confidence in him.*

Many, indeed, *say* they have faith in him, whom I cannot believe—because the world overcomes them: whereas he who believes on Jesus "overcomes the world." Saving faith, or faith unfeigned, with me, is confidence, faith, or trust in Jesus of Nazareth as the Son of God, the all-sufficient Saviour of sinners.

The next quotation from my writings, (and on such an occasion I answer only for my views as I have expressed them,) is the following:

"In his Preface to his New Testament Mr. Campbell repeats this view: 'When one question of fact is answered in the affirmative, the way of happiness is laid open, and all doubts on the nature of true piety and humanity are dissipated. The fact is a historic one, and this question is of the same nature. It is this—*Was Jesus the Nazarene the Son and Apostle of God?* This question is capable of being converted into various forms—such as, Are the subsequent narratives true? Did Jesus actually and literally rise from the dead after being crucified and interred? Did he ascend into heaven in the presence of his disciples? Is he constituted the Judge of the living and the dead? or, Was he an impostor and a deceiver of men? It may be proposed in many a form; but it is still a unit, and amounts to this—*Is Jesus the Nazarene the Son of God, the Apostle of the Father, the Saviour of men? When this question*

is answered in the affirmative, our duty, our salvation, and our happiness are ascertained and determined." Mill. Harb. Vol. VI. p. 82.

To this I fully subscribe; and the person that does not, had need to examine himself whether he be in the faith, or whether he believes on the Son of God: for surely if any one believes on him he will believe what he says, and what his Apostles said. And so explicit is Paul on this subject, that he simplifies still farther, and affirms that "if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved."*

He next proceeds to my second fundamental error—"The Doctrine of Campbell on Regeneration." The Doctrine he expresses as follows:—

1. "With one consent the Campbellites declare that regeneration, or being born again, is essential to salvation."
2. "Mr. Campbell and his friends declare that immersion in water is essential to regeneration."
3. "Mr. Campbell and his friends teach that immersion in water is absolutely essential to forgiveness of sins."
4. "The Campbellites declare that immersion in water and regeneration are two names for the same thing."

Under these allegations some words of mine and of other persons, found in my volumes, frequently dislocated, and never taken in their whole connexion, are offered as proof. From these, most repulsive corolaries are deduced, and the sentence of damnable heresy and palpable absurdity is reiterated with greater zest.

As this portion of the review is managed, it is a tissue of misrepresentation and perversion from beginning to end. Three of the four propositions are truly and properly false and delusive. The last, though not in form, false and perverted, is made so by its connexion with the others, and the main drift of the meaning attached to one of the terms in it. Oh! for a little of that candor and charity so often commended, but so seldom exhibitted from the pulpit and the religious press of this backsliding age! Had Mr. Landis given my definition of the word "*salvation*," and of the word "*regeneration*," or of "*washing of regeneration*," it would have saved him and myself some trouble, and his readers much imposition and deception. In his definition of the terms I may be branded with wanton error; in mine I am as scriptural, rational, and consistent as Paul is with himself in Athens, in Corinth, and in Rome.

With many of Mr. Landis readers "to get to heaven" and "to be saved" are synonymous phrases. Salvation, with me, is either temporal, spiritual, or eternal. I have, times without number, affirmed

* Romans x. 9.

my conviction that many will be found in heaven who never believed, repented, or were baptized. Often have we spoken of the salvation of our persons from the physical evils of this life—of our souls from the guilt, the pollution, and the power of sin; and of the salvation of our bodies from the grave—of our eternal redemption from every vestige of the consequences of moral evil. And having defined these three unequivocal acceptations of that term, I have been careful to a fault to show in which of these acceptations it is connected with baptism or regeneration.

All this is here passed over as though Mr. Landis knew nothing about it, and as if I used the word *salvation* in its popular meaning. A single passage from my writings would have made my meaning not only evident, but acceptable to all intelligent Protestants. It is a passage, too, found under date of July 5, 1830, in my first Extra on Remission of Sins:—

"We enter the kingdom of nature by being born of the flesh; we enter the kingdom of heaven, or come under the reign of Jesus Christ, in this life, by being born of water and the Spirit; we enter the kingdom of eternal glory by being born again from the earth, and neither by faith nor the first regeneration; neither by faith nor baptism, but by being counted worthy of the resurrection of the just—'I was hungry and you fed me;' not because you believed, or were born of water; but because 'I was hungry and you fed me,' &c.

"There are three births, three kingdoms, and three salvations: One from the womb of our first mother, one from the water, and one from the grave. We enter a new world on, and not before, each birth. The present animal life, at the first birth; the spiritual, or the life of God in our souls, at the second birth; and the life eternal in the presence of God, at the third birth. And he who dreams of entering the second kingdom, or coming under the dominion of Jesus, without the second birth—may, to complete his error, dream of entering the kingdom of glory without a resurrection from the dead!

"Grace precedes all these births—shines in all the kingdoms; but will be glorified in the third. Sense is the principle of action in the first kingdom; faith, in the second; and sight spiritual, in the third. The first salvation is that of the body from the dangers and ills of life, and God is thus 'the Saviour of all men;' the second salvation is that of the soul from sin; the third is that of both soul and body united, delivered from moral and natural corruption, and introduced into the presence of God, when God shall be all in all."*

With the above, and many similar definitions and expositions in our view, let us now transcribe those four perversions called "the Doctrines of Campbellism:—

1. "They with one consent declare that the phrase 'washing of regeneration,' found only once in the New Testament, refers to baptism, and is equivalent to that term, in primitive usage, and that this

* Christianity Restored. p. 239.

'washing of regeneration' is necessary to the present *salvation of the soul* from the guilt, pollution, and power of sin."

2. "Mr. Campbell and his friends declare that immersion in water is necessary to 'the washing of regeneration."

3. "Mr. Campbell and his friends teach that immersion in water is *not absolutely*, but *relatively* essential to the forgiveness of sins."

4. "The Campbellites declare that immersion in water and 'the washing of regeneration' are two names for the same action."

I do not, indeed, altogether approve of the verbiage of the above propositions; but if I must keep up to the style of Mr. Landis, and with a reference to his caricature and travesty of our views express myself, I give the above as all that any candid, honest, and truth-speaking man could possibly exhibit from my writings as my views on these points; any thing else is downright misrepresentation and calumny.

The term *regeneration*, as shown in my Essay on Regeneration, occurs but twice in the New Testament, and once has respect to a new order of things. But I have been at great pains to define both the scriptural and popular acceptation of this term. One passage from my Extra on Regeneration fully demonstrates the moral incompetency of Mr. L. to present my views fairly:—

Regeneration literally indicates the whole process of renovating new-creating man. "This process may consist of numerous distinct acts; but it is in accordance with general usage to give to the beginning, or consummating act, the name of the whole process. For the most part, however, the name of the whole process is given to the consummating act, because the process is always supposed incomplete until that act is performed. For example: In the process of tanning, fulling, forging, &c. the subject of these operations is not supposed to be tanned, fulled, forged, until the last act is performed. So in all the processes of nature. In the animal, vegetable, and mineral kingdoms, the last act consummates the process. To all acquainted with the process of animalization, germination, crystalization, &c. no farther argument is needed. But, in the style of our American husbandmen, no crop nor animal is *made* until it come to maturity. We often hear them say of a good shower, or of a few clear days, 'This is the *making* of the wheat, or corn!' In the same sense it is that most Christians call *regeneration* THE NEW BIRTH; though *being born* is only the last act in natural generation, and the last act in regeneration.

"In this way the *new birth* and *regeneration* are used indiscriminately by commentators and writers on theology; and by a figure of speech it is justified on well established principles of rhetoric.

"By the *'bath of regeneration'* is not meant the first, second, or third act; but the last act of regeneration, which completes the whole, and is therefore used to denote the new birth. This is the reason why our Lord and his Apostles unite this act with water. Being *born of water*, in the Saviour's style, and *the bath of regeneration*, in the Apostles' style, in the judgment of all writers and critics of eminence, refer to

one and the same act, viz.—Christian baptism. Hence it came to pass, that *all the ancients* (as fully proved in our first Extra on Remission) used the word *regeneration* as synonymous in signification with *immersion*. In addition to the numerous quotations made in our Essay on Remission, from the creeds and liturgies of Protestant churches, we shall add another from the Common Prayer of the Church of England, showing unequivocally that the learned Doctors of that church used the words *regeneration* and *baptism* as synonymous. In the address and prayer of the Minister after the baptism of the child, he is commanded to say—

"Seeing now, dearly beloved brethren, that this child is regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's church, let us give thanks unto Almighty God for these benefits, and with one accord make our prayer unto him that this child may lead the rest of his life according to this beginning.'——[*Then shall be said, all kneeling*]—'We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate this infant with thy Holy Spirit, to receive him for thine own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into thy holy church. And humbly we beseech thee to grant that he, being dead unto sin, and living unto righteousness, and being buried with Christ in his death, may crucify the old man, and utterly abolish the whole body of sin; and that as he is made partaker of the death of the Son, he may also be partaker of his resurrection; so that finally, with the residue of thy holy church, he may be an inheritor of thine everlasting kingdom, through Christ our Lord. Amen!' " *

Another extract on the NEW BIRTH, from the same Essay, will farther manifest the great injustice done my views by the garbled extracts and corollaries of the *reverend* gentleman:—

"We have already seen that the consummation of the process of regeneration, or creation, is in the birth of the creature formed. So it is in the moral generation, or in the great process of regeneration. There is a state of existence from which he that is born passes; and there is a state of existence into which he enters at birth. This is true of the whole animal creation, whether oviparous or viviparous. Now the manner of existence, or the mode of life, is wholly changed; and he is, in reference to the former state, dead; and to the new state, alive. So in moral regeneration. The subject of this great change, before his new birth, existed in one state; but after it, he exists in another. He stands in a new relation to God, angels, and men. He is now born of God, and has the privilege of being a son of God, and is consequently pardoned, justified, sanctified, adopted, saved. The state which he left was a state of condemnation, what some call 'the state of nature.' The state into which he enters is a state of favor, in which he enjoys all the heavenly blessings through Christ: therefore it is called 'the kingdom of heaven.' All this is signified in his death, burial, and resurrection with Christ, or in his being born of water. Hence the necessity of being buried with Christ in water, that he may be born of water—that he may enjoy the renewal of the Holy Spirit, and be placed under the reign of favor.

"*All the means of salvation are means of enjoyment—not of procure-*

* Millennial Harbinger, vol. 4, 1833, p. 352.

ment. Birth itself is not for procuring, but for enjoying the life possessed before birth. So in this figure—no one is to be baptized, or to be buried with Christ; no one is to be put under the water of regeneration for the purpose of *procuring* life, but for the purpose of *enjoying* the life of which he is possessed. If the child is never born, all its sensitive powers and faculties cannot be enjoyed; for it is after birth that these are fully developed, and feasted upon all the aliments and objects of sense in nature. Hence all that is *now* promised in the gospel can only be *enjoyed* by those who are born again and placed in the kingdom of heaven under all its influences. Hence the philosophy of that necessity which Jesus preached—'Unless a man be born again he cannot discern the kingdom of heaven—unless a man be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into it.'

"But let no man think that in the act of being born, either naturally or metaphorically, the child purchases, procures, or merits either life or its enjoyments. He is only by his birth placed in circumstances favorable to the enjoyment of life, and all that makes life a blessing. 'To as many as received him, believing in his name, he granted the privilege of being children of God, who derive not their birth from blood, nor from the desire of the flesh, nor from the will of man, but from God."*

I am no less travestied and caricatured—no less calumniated on the subject of remission of sins as connected with baptism, than on the subject of baptism as connected with the whole renovation or process of regeneration. A more flagitious perversion I have never met with than that expressed in the third dogma imputed to me—"Mr. Campbell and his friends teach that immersion in water is *absolutely* essential to forgiveness of sins." The most charitable construction I can put upon this, is, that Mr. L. does not understand his own language, or select his terms with discrimination. *Absolutely essential* to forgiveness! This is equal to 'No baptism, no forgiveness' in time or to eternity, for man, woman, or child. I never thought, uttered, or wrote such an idea. Mr. L. uses words without discrimination. At one time he says we "employ the terms regeneration, conversion, and immersion as synonymes." The proof he adduces is, "*Conversion*, *regeneration*, and *immersion* are all descriptive of the same thing." Now can Mr. L. confound *synonymous* terms with terms *descriptive of the same thing!* When I speak of Mr. Landis as my "reviewer," his "reverence," &c., do I, in using these terms as descriptive of him, authorize him to say that I use the words *Mr. Landis*, my *reviewer*, and his *reverence* as three synonymous words! I charitably hope, therefore, that his use of the words "absolutely essential" is owing to a lack of discrimination, rather than to intentional slander or actual maliciousness. Have I not repeatedly said, that "neither faith, repentance, nor baptism is *absolutely essential* to the future and eternal salvation:" for then infant

* M. H. vol. iv. 1839, p. 355.

salvation would be impossible. But faith, repentance, baptism, are necessary to our *present enjoyment* of the grace of God—to the present *assurance* and *enjoyment* of the remission of our sins and adoption into the family of God. "He that *believeth* and is *baptized* shall be *saved*" —"Repent and be *baptized* for the remission of sins"—"The like figure whereunto baptism doth also *now save us*."

My jaundiced friend has given us a string of propositions, syllogisms, and corollaries that really confound me. I know not whether to regard him as acting the knave or the simpleton. Listen, reader, to a few of them:—

1. "The faith which the Campbellites contend for has, confessedly, no connexion whatever with regeneration. They are truly separate!"
2. "Faith has no real connexion with pardon."
3. "Mr. Campbell repeatedly ridicules the idea of the agency of the Spirit of God in the exercise of faith."

Never, Mr. Landis—no, never! These three imputations are an outrage against reason, religion, morality. Why should Mr. Landis have noticed a system so preposterous! Surely it could not subsist one year. But hear him farther:—

4. "Infants, who die in infancy, are either lost; or, if saved, they are saved without being regenerated."

On the two points of regeneration and remission, I have written two Extras, two full essays, which have been so definite and intelligible, at least, as to impart the same views to many thousands of all sects and persuasions; and of great variety of natural endowments, as well as educational prejudices. But never have I known such a perversion of any two pieces as that matured and exhibited on the pages of the Biblical Repository.

To prevent, as I imagine, the charge of Neoligism, or wanton innovation, and all mistake too about my meaning, I concluded the last edition of my Extra on Remission with the following collection of witnesses, most of whom have at sundry times before appeared in my writings. Ten confessions of faith, and eight of them Protestant are summoned, viz:—

"BAPTIST. *Chap.* XXX. *Sec.* 1.—"Baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, to be unto the party baptized a sign of his fellowship with him in his death and resurrection; of his being engrafted into him; of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ; to live and walk in newness of life."

"The Baptist follows the Presbyterian church as servilely as the Methodist church follows the English hierarchy. But she avows her faith that immersion is a *sign* of remission. A sign of the past, the present, or the future! A sign accompanying!

"*The Confession of Bohemia.*—"We believe that whatsoever by baptism—is in the outward ceremony signified and witnessed, all *that* doth the Lord God perform inwardly. That is, he washeth away sin, begetteth a man again, and bestoweth salvation upon him: for the bestowing of these excellent fruits was holy baptism given and granted to the church."

"*The Confession of Augsburg.*—"Concerning baptism, they teach that it is necessary to salvation, as a ceremony ordained of Christ: also, by baptism the grace of God is offered."

"*The Confession of Saxony.*—"I baptize thee—that is, I do witness that by this dipping, thy sins be washed away, and that thou art now received of the true God."

"*The Confession of Whittenburg.*—"We believe and confess that baptism is that sea, into the bottom whereof, as the Prophet saith, God doth cast all our sins."

"*The Confession of Helvetia.*—"To be baptized in the name of Christ, is to be enrolled, entered, and received into the covenant and family, and so into the inheritance of the sons of God; that is to say, to be called the sons of God, to be purged also from the filthiness of sins, and to be endued with the manifold grace of God, for to lead a new and innocent life."

"*The Confession of Sueveland.*—"As touching baptism, we confess that it is the font of regeneration, washeth away sins and saveth us. But all these things we do understand as St. Peter doth interpret them. 1 Peter iii. 21."

"*Westminster Assembly.*—"Before baptism the minister is to use some words of instruction—showing that it is instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ; that it is a seal of the covenant of grace, of our engrafting into Christ, and of our union with him, of remission of sins, regeneration, and life eternal."

"The Roman Catholic and the Greek church say, "We believe in one baptism for the remission of sins." "

These are again sustained by Calvin, Wesley, and many other distinguished leaders of public opinion:—

"Calvin makes remission the principal thing in baptism.*

"Baptism," says he, "resembles a legal instrument properly attested, by which he assures us that all our sins are cancelled, effaced, and obliterated, so that they will never appear in his sight, or come into his remembrance, or be imputed to us. For he commands all, who believe, to be baptized for the remission of their sins. Therefore, those who have imagined that baptism is nothing more than a mark or sign by which we profess our religion before men, as soldiers wear the insignia of their sovereign as a mark of their profession, have not considered that which was the *principal* thing in baptism; which is, that we ought to receive it with this promise—'He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved.' "

"John Wesley, in his comment on the New Testament, (page 350,) speeks plainer than either the Methodist discipline or the Regular Baptist Confession. His words are:—"Baptism administered to real

* Inst. 1. 4, c. xv. page 327.

penitents, is both a *means* and a *seal* of pardon. Nor did God ordinarily, in the primitive church, bestow this (pardon) on any, unless through this means." This is almost, if not altogether, as much as we have said on the forgiveness of sins through immersion."

With these documents, now for years before the public, I leave it to the good sense of my readers to say, why should I be thus slandered for saying sometimes less, and never more, than has been said by the wisest and best portions of the Christian church, in her purest and most undegenerate days! We do go farther than the theory: we *practise* what we preach. This is our greatest *error* in this age of empty professions and idle speculations.

6. "All mankind, therefore, according to the Campbellites, who are not immersed, perish forever."

We cannot but thank Mr. Landis for this consummation of his ridicule. It reminds me of a caricature I read of the French, during the wars of Napoleon, which the author perfected, by giving the description of a Frenchman's nose, that a little more than equalled the entire head of a full Englishman. Nothing, Mr. Landis, like capping the climax well. Like a certain Canadian Autobiographist, you close admirably. In describing one of his adventures, he records a sect of people whom he discovered far north, who buried themselves in pyramids of snow during the winter, where, in a state of perfect torpidity, they slept six months without eating or drinking, and gently awoke every spring by the melting of the mountains in which they were comfortably encased.

But to be serious. Mr Landis is pre-eminently unfortunate in all his conceptions of this monstrous thing nick-named Campbellism: or he has less discernment or more knavery, than any theological pugilist I have ever encountered. It is impossible that any man of common education and common sense, who has ever read one volume of my writings, could honestly impute to me such a tissue of nonsense and absurdity as he gravely accumulates in the whole extent of the review.

After the development of the fundamental principles of Campbellism, our learned and critical reviewer takes up John iii. 5, Titus iii. 5, Acts xxii. 16, Matth. xvi. 16, Acts ii. 38, and endeavors to show that we have misapplied these scriptures in our controversy with the sects.

On the first of these he says that our former opponents have taken wrong ground, and that consequently in all these collisions our cause has triumphed. But he says we have assumed that *hudoor*, water, means *water*, in the phrase "*born of water and the Spirit.*" On the contrary he assumes that it does not mean water, but "constantly quite the reverse." Can any one tell what is quite the reverse of water! Is it fire, or earth, or spirit, or what!

Sometimes, he says, it means *spirit*, and quotes John iv. 10, and vii. 39. But there it is "*living water*," that is used for the symbol of spiritual influences, as it is in Apocalypse, xxii. 1—17. He cannot produce a single passage in the New Testament where *water* means *spirit*. Though he affirms that "*constantly*" water in the New Testament, means quite the reverse. Yes! "constantly" is his own word. It was the spirit then, that Jesus converted into wine, at the marriage of Cana. John said, I baptize you in *water*, that is, I baptize you in the Spirit. The ship was filled with water, i. e. with the Spirit!!!

The term *water* is found in the New Testament fifty times, and where it is impossible, from the connexion, it can mean any thing else. When it is used figuratively, it has some epithet affixed or prefixed, as "*water of life*," "living water." But again, I repeat, it is as baseless and as truthless an assertion as was ever made, that the word "*water*" means not the element of water: but in the New Testament "it constantly means the reverse." "What wild beasts there are yet living at Ephesus!!" In what awful straits do these spiritualizers place themselves while opposing the truth! If it will add any thing to my interpretation, be it known that the whole Westminster Assembly, the Church of England, the Greek and Roman churches, all the primitive fathers sustain my views of this passage.

The curious reader might desire to know how a theologian so spiritually learned would interpret this passage. We shall gratify him with this literary treat:—"Unless you are baptized internally, or with spiritual water, you cannot, &c. be saved." Such is the new version of this passage; by the magic potency of which, not only I, but the primitive fathers, the Greek, Roman, English confessions, churches, and standards are refuted. I cannot spend time in farther exposing such puerile trifling with sacred things. Times without number have we replied to every thing else he has said upon this passage. We have long interpreted John iii. 5, as follows:—

The kingdom of God, of which Jesus spoke, was at this time future, not yet come; and Jesus is often speaking of it, and setting forth its advent and character under various appropriate similitudes. Here he speaks of *admission* into it in contradistinction from *admission* into the Jewish or fleshly kingdom of God No one by fleshly birth can enter this kingdom. He must be born again—*born of water and of Spirit;* not of "Spirit and Spirit—not of spiritual water,"—not of immersion alone; but by immersion and the quickening influence of the Spirit of God. Mr. L. may as justly say that spirit means water, as to say that water means spirit; or he may as justly say that spirit constantly means quite the reverse of spirit, as that water, in the New Testament, constantly means quite the reverse of that element.

Our erudite reviewer next attempts to take from us Titus iii. 5.—"Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us *by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit.*" By the phrase "renewing of the Holy Spirit" Mr. Landis understands the washing of the new birth, or of regeneration. There is, according to him, no allusion here to baptism. It is, or should be read, 'By the washing of regeneration, *even* the renewing of the Holy Spirit"—the last clause as an exegetical reiteration of the first. He also quotes the Roman Catholic editions of the Vulgate to prove him right, while he acknowledges that the Rhemish translators departed from the common text of the Vulgate.

Suppose I should place the Westminster Divines, the Presbyterian church, the Roman Catholic, and the Episcopalian, against Mr. Landis and the Vulgate. What then? Or suppose I should quote the Presbyterian Matthew Henry, whose words are sustained by all the preceding. What will Mr. Landis say? "The outward sign and seal thereof in baptism is here called the washing of regeneration." Again, on the same passage he says, "Thus baptism saves figuratively and sacramentally where it is rightly used. Acts xxii. 16." So adds he Ephesians v. 26. "That he might sanctify and cleanse it by the washing of water by the word." But Mr. Landis will say I must not put him down by authority, but by argument. What, then, is his argument? It is this, that *kai*, often translated *and*, is sometimes translated *even;* and because sometimes translated *even*, it must be so translated here! But for what reason? There is but one given;—the version must be so changed to enable Mr. Landis to oppose my application of it! Irresistible logic! But does an exegetical exposition make both clauses, that preceding the conjunction and that following, allude to the same thing? If so, then "washing with water" and the "word of life" are two names for the same action: for, says the Spirit, (Eph. v. 26.) "He cleansed the church by the washing with water—even by the word:" i. e. the washing with water and the word of God are two names for the same action

We have sometimes rendered *kai* by *even*, in *apposition*, or in clear unambiguous exposition; and especially when no other word will make sense—as, instead of God *and* the Father, we say God, *even* the Father—equivalent to *God the Father*. But never ought it to be so rendered between independent members of a sentence as merely exegetical, making the last a mere rendition of the first. Let us try Mr. L.'s canon of criticism: "He will baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire"—i. e. *even* in fire. Fire is, then, the *exegesis* of Spirit. "Repent and be baptized every one of you—Repent, *even* be baptized every

one of you. Baptism is, then, the meaning of repentance! Again, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved. Mr. L.'s rule says, 'He that believes, *even* is baptized, shall be saved.' Mr. Landis on his own assumption, is a super-Origenated Campbellite. See where his criticism ends! By this time I trust he will begin to believe that

"A *little* learning is a dangerous thing!"

If his rule were sound, and if I desired to be as heterodox as he would have me to be, it would indeed exceedingly strengthen my cause. But with all the helps it offers, I reject it as preposterous and absurd.

But is it a fact, as Mr. Landis would have his readers believe, that the Roman church interprets Titus iii. 5., as not referring to baptism? Our reviewer is mistaken. Their words on that very text are, "As before in the sacrament of holy orders, so here it is plain that baptism giveth grace; and that by it, as by an instrumental cause, we are saved." See the Rhemish Testament, Tit. iii. 5.—"Translated out of the Vulgate, and first published by the English College at Rheims." I care not an atom what the Roman Catholic or Protestant churches may say; but I quote this to show how much credit is due to the quotations and comments of my pious reviewer. Macknight also supports our views. Indeed, I know no critic, translator, or scholar, living or dead, who has any fellowship for the bold and presumptuous gloss of this would-be critic of a matter which he does not understand.

Next comes Acts xx. 16—"Be baptized, brother Saul, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." Paul ought to have said, or in fact did say, according to the interpretation of Mr. L., 'Receive the external sign of having obtained the remission of sins.' Mr. L.s argument here is that Paul was to wash away his sins by prayer, and not by baptism. He makes the phrase "calling upon the name of the Lord," according to my rule of interpreting participles with imperative moods, express the manner of washing away sins, rather than of being baptized. He cuts off the first clause; and, rejecting baptism from the imperative mood, "be baptized," he reads it, "Wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." He takes away from the word of the Lord the command 'Be baptized,' which, in fact, is the whole precept; and takes the motive given for the action as the principal imperative. I know not what a man may not prove or disprove by such a license or indulgence from the Pope.

But that this presumption may be refuted as well as condemned, will the reader please reflect that Paul had been invoking the name of the Lord for some time before Ananias gave him this precept. Of course, then, his calling upon the name of the Lord had not availed to the washing away of sins till Ananias came. Now who can believe

that Ananias simply commanded Paul to do what he had been doing for some time: for, said Jesus before he sent Ananias, "Behold he prayeth." Did Ananias then go and say, 'Brother Saul, arise and wash away your sins, praying on as you have been doing'! To Mr. Landis it is hard to kick against the spears. Is it not, then, by a *reduction to an absurdity* most evident that Mr. L.'s cutting off the proper imperative, and applying to the exegesis what belongs to the precept, "*Be baptized*," converts the whole passage, together with the mission of Ananias, into an empty and unmeaning ceremony, alike unworthy of the Lord and unmeaning to Saul?

Mr. Landis next tries his canons on Mark xvi. 16:—"He that believes and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damed."

Mr. L. himself, by the sheer force of conviction from these strong passages, does indeed concede in two periods all that for which we contend, and on account of which he has so unjustly misrepresented, perverted, and abused us. His words, p. 128, on Mark xvi. 16. are, "As no person can dispense with any *acknowledged* command of Christ, and be in a salvable state, I conceive water baptism to be essential to the salvation of all who admit the ordinance to be enjoined by Christ, provided it be in their power to obey the command." Thank the Lord that truth is so omnipotent as to force from the lips of one so hostile to our views as Mr. L., a full affirmation of all that for which we contend. I never affirmed, preached, or taught more than Mr. L. has now conceded. So long as he sticks to these words he is, on baptism, as great a heretic as myself. He adds, as if to show that we have not misunderstood him, the following words:—"It was *not*, however, essential to the salvation of the dying malefactor, nor is it to the person who may truly repent on his death-bed, or in any circumstances in which it is impossible to render obedience to the command." This is precisely our own oft-repeated defence of ourselves against those who, because of the doctrine affirmed by Mr. L. in the first period, have represented us as making baptism as *absolutely* essential to salvation as faith.—Well now Mr. Landis and I are positively and incontrovertibly standing upon the same ground, as all my readers know, upon his own declarations wrested from him in the presence of Mark xvi. 16. I most cordially adopt every word in the above two periods as expressing all that for which I have ever contended on the relation of baptism to salvation. It is essential to the eternal salvation of every man "who admits the ordinance to be enjoined by Christ, provided always it be in his power to obey the command." After this agreement he may dispose of his farther remarks on that passage as he pleases. If they

do not pinch him, they do not pinch me: for we are precisely agreed, as before affirmed.

He concludes this portion of his review with Acts ii. 38. For the curiosity of the affair, I shall give all that Mr. L. writes upon this passage. Any one conversant with our writings will see how imperfectly acquainted he is with our views; for, in fact, he refutes himself and confirms our views in this critique on Acts ii. 38. But we shall let him tell the whole story on our pages. I will only affix a note or two.

"This passage thus reads: "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, for the remission of sins:" and from it the Campbellites argue that baptism is as intimately connected with remission as repentance is: and that remission cannot be obtained without baptism, any more than without repentance. But repentance is essential to salvation, and therefore so is baptism.

"It will not be disputed that the idea contained in this passage may, with propriety and correctness, be rendered "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, that your sins may be remitted:" *eis aphesin amartion.* In our translation, *for* seems to convey a a meaning not supported by the original. The word is not *gar* but *eis;* be baptized *unto* the remission of sins." It steers clear of the idea of *desert* being attached to baptism; and this in fact is Mr. Campbell's own rendering: "Reform, and be each of you immersed in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the remission of sins."

"The confidence with which Mr. Campbell relies on this passage, in support of his system, may be seen by the following quotation from his *Extra*, No. 1. p. 14. "They were informed that though they now believed and repented, *they were not pardoned;* and must reform, and be immersed, for the remission of sins."—"This testimony, when the speaker, the occasion, and the congregation, are all taken in view, is itself alone sufficient to establish the point."

"But what is it, I ask, to be baptized *eis aphesin amartion?* The clause can easily be understood by a reference to a few of similar construction. "John preached the baptism of repentance (*eis*) *into the remission of sins*"—the same phrase. See Mark i. 4. So Rom. vi. 3, "Know ye not that as many of us as were baptized (*eis*) *into* Jesus Christ," etc. 1 Cor. x. 2, "And were all baptized (*eis*) *into* Moses." Matth. iii. 11, "I indeed baptize you with water (*eis*) *into* repentance." These references are sufficient. The construction is precisely parallel to the one under consideration. And now we ask,—What did John the Baptist mean by "I baptize you unto repentance?" Did he mean that *repentance was brought about by baptism?* If not, how can it be imagined, that when Peter used the expression, "Be baptized into the remission of sins," he meant that baptism was to bring about remission of sins? A similar question may be asked in relation to the other passages referred to."

John, according to Dr. G. Campbell, says "I baptize you, that you may reform." You repent. I immerse you then into the profession of a new life, that you may reform; or, in order to an actual reformation for the remission of your sins. Mark i. 2. No difficulty in the style.

"But let us take another brief view of it. With what is *eis aphesin amartion* (remission of sins) here connected? With repentance, or baptism, or both? Peter himself, who uses the expression, shall also answer the question: "*Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out,*" etc. Acts iii. 19. If then water baptism is in every case as inseparably connected with forgiveness as repentance is, Peter has here committed an unpardonable omission. If he has made no omission, then the vital connection in the text under review is not between baptism and remission, but between repentance and remission."

This is equally as illogical and short-sighted as the remarks on "wash away thy sins;" only with this difference, that not finding any use for the last imperative "*be converted,*" he cuts it off and makes Peter say repent that your sins may be blotted out. But we have long ago shown that the command, be converted, here is precisely equivalent to the Pentecostian, Repent and be baptized for the remission of sins. And although Mr. L. must have read it in the Extra, he had the prudence, or the cowardice to pay no attention to it.

"But further: The peculiar circumstances of the case mentioned in Acts ii. 38, prove it to be a *particular instance* in the strictest sense of the term: and it is illogical and utterly out of the question to deduce *general* conclusions from it, and apply them to the present circumstances of mankind at large. I have no objections to allow that in the case of the persons here spoken of, baptism may have been essential to remission; and yet this case would afford no ground for concluding that baptism is essential to remission *in every case.* But unless this can be shown, the passage confessedly affords no support whatever to the system. A few remarks will show how peculiar were their circumstances.

1. "The persons here spoken of, must either have obeyed the command, and have been baptized, or have remained open and avowed enemies to the cause of Christ.

2. "It was the best possible, and in fact the only satisfactory evidence that they could then give, of their sincerity in renouncing Judaism and embracing Christianity. The step involved the loss of all things.

3. "*They*, circumstanced as they were, could not even *innocently* mistake, or misunderstand the command. The Apostles were present, and if any difficulty occurred it could be promptly obviated. Hence it was not even possible for them to be in error respecting their duty on the subject.

4. "They had ample time and opportunity to obey the command.

"Now to disobey under such circumstances, must argue an impenitent, unhumbled heart. And to the possessor of such a heart remission could not be granted. And hence baptism was essential to the remission of their sins."

This is enough—and all I ask from any man on this subject. When any man can then say that he comes not within the purview of this particular instance of opening the gospel dispensation on Pentecost, I, with Mr. L., will say it is not his duty to be baptized. I believe that the four particulars above stated by Mr. L. are all very judicious; and when they all concur I hold baptism to be essential even to the everlast-

ing salvation. But in the next paragraph Mr. L. exactly expresses my views.

"In the same sense that baptism was essential to the remission of sins in this case, it is also essential to remission at the present time; e. g. when it is admitted that baptism is positively enjoined on all his followers of Christ; and when there is time and opportunity to obey the command. Under these circumstances I do contend that no one can be in a salvable state while he lives in the open violation of this command. We have no more right, under these circumstances, to dispense with this, than with any other acknowledged command of the Saviour."

This is the Alpha and the Omega of all that I have said and written on this subject. I ask no more. In whatever way Mr. L. can defend this paragraph from all he has written upon the subject, in the same manner he can defend me. His defence is mine. Here, as on Mark xvi. 16., we stand exactly on the same ground. Farther than this I have never gone. This is Campbellism in the superlative degree. If I could think Mr. Landis was a sincere good man, and honest in this assertion, I would hail him as a brother.

"But then it does not follow that if baptism be essential to the salvation of persons thus situated, it therefore is essential in the case of persons not similarly circumstanced; e. g. of sick persons, or of others, in whose cases it would be impossible to administer the ordinance. Yet unless it does follow that baptism is absolutely essential to remission *in every instance*, the passage confessedly affords no support to the theory that baptism is essential to the forgiveness of sin. If but *one instance* can be produced (and I have produced a number already) wherein it is admitted that remission of sins either was, or may be granted without baptism, the argument attempted to be deduced from this passage is false.

"But on this subject we want no better authority than that of Mr. Campbell himself. Let us therefore hear him. On page 165, volume VII. of his *Christian Baptist*, he says: "*I doubt not* but such Pædobaptists as simply *mistake* the meaning and design of the Christian institution, who nevertheless are, as far as they know, obedient disciples of Jesus, *will be admitted into the kingdom of glory*." Now Mr. Campbell maintains that Pædobaptists are not baptized. Of course then, he himself being judge, the passage under consideration does not prove that baptism is equally essential to salvation as repentance. For while he admits that no sinner can be saved without repentance, he also "*doubts not*" that the unbaptized Pædobaptist may be saved. It follows therefore, that according to Mr. Campbell's own testimony, the Campbellite exposition of Acts ii 38, is false."

It also follows as logically that, according to Mr. Landis' own testimony, Mr. Landis' exposition of Acts ii. 38. is false.

"It is also worthy of remark that although in this instance we find "repentance, baptism, and remission of sins," in connection; yet in other passages we find "repentance and remission of sins" without any reference to baptism. A fact wholly inexplicable on the theory that

sins are remitted by baptism. An instance of this has been given above; and the following are a few others. Acts v. 31, "Him hath God exalted with his own right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance unto Israel and remission of sins." Luke xxiv. 47, "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations." See also Acts ix. 18. 2 Cor. vii. 10. Hence Paul also tells us, (1 Cor. i. 17,) that "Christ sent him not to baptize but to preach the Gospel;" and he thanks God that he baptized "*none*" of the Corinthians, save a very few."

If Mr. Landis can reconcile this with all that he has said here and on Mark xvi. 16., he can as easily reconcile it with all that I have said: for we have both said the same things, and he is just as much bound now to refute himself as I am. On the connexion between baptism and remission he has said enough for me. I am told, too, he has been immersed for the remission of his sins. I presume it must be true! What say you, Mr. Landis? Then Campbellism is a terrible thing when even its warmest foes are constrained, even in the agony of their struggles, to affirm all its most peculiar and offensive dogmata. Mr. Landis, as far as he is gone, is pretty orthodox on baptism for remission of sins. Few of our warmest preachers have ever gone as far as the Rev. Mr. Landis, of Jeffersonville, Pa.

Calvin himself was too strong a Campbellite for me. On cutting the leaves of his article on baptism since writing the preceding, I perceive that he is not only with me, but even before me and Mr. Landis in his views of baptism as connected with immersion. Hear him:—

"In this sense we are to understand what is said by Paul, that Christ sanctifieth and cleanseth the Church "with the washing of the water by the word:" and in another place, that "according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost:" and by Peter: that "baptism doth save us." For it was not the intention of Paul to signify that our ablution and salvation are completed by the water, or that water contains in itself the virtue to purify, regenerate, and renew: nor did Peter mean that it was the cause of salvation, but only that the knowledge and assurance of it is received in this sacrament: which is sufficiently evident from the words they used. For Paul connects togeter the "word of life" and "the baptism of water;" as if he had said that our ablution and sanctification are announced to us by the Gospel, and by baptism this message is confirmed."

"Nor must it be supposed that baptism is administered only for the time past, so that for sins into which we fall after baptism it would be necessary to seek other new remedies of expiation in I know not what other sacraments, as if the virtue of baptism were become obsolete. In consequence of this error, it happened in former ages, that some persons would not be baptized except at the close of their life, and almost in the moment of their death, that so they might obtain pardon for their whole life; a preposterous caution, which is frequently censured in the writings of the ancient bishops. But we ought to conclude, that at whatever time we are baptized, we are washed and purified for the whole of life. Whenever we have fallen, therefore, we must recur to the remembrance of baptism, and arm our minds with the consideration of it, that we may be always certified and assured of the remission of our sins. For though, when it has been once administered, it appears to be past, yet it is not abolished by subsequent sins. For the purity of Christ is offered to us in it; and that always retains its virtue, is never overcome by any blemishes, but purifies and obliterates all our defilements."

I wish I had room for the whole article. Our Calvinistic opponents are either very ignorant persons of their own system, or very great knaves. Calvin and Luther are with us most clearly and fully, as any one may see who examines their writings.

The second part of the Review is decidedly more perverse that the

first. It was conceived under a more ominous star—inspired by a more unclean spirit—and born under more hostile fates. Its maliciousness is only excelled by its impotency to fasten upon my views the character of Unitarianism; and upon my moral reputation the stain of having deceitfully imposed upon the community a translation of my own, for that of Drs. Campbell, McKnight, and Doddridge. The genius of sectarianism is doubtless a most malign genius, intent on the massacre of the character of all who have the independence to think contrary to its prescriptions, or the daring to oppose its bold assumptions. The truth and its advocates have always been alike subjected to the vengeance and blasphemers of this world, and those deeply inspired with its spirit.

It has been our good fortune to have inherited a double portion of the anathremas and denunciations, the false imputations and slanders of the enemies of the pure and uncorrupt religion of the New Testament. For ourselves we care but little; indeed it is a pleasure to be persecuted and falsely represented by our enemies for righteousness sake—for our zeal and devotion to the faith anciently delivered to the saints. But to prevent the loss of that influence, which we ought to have with this community, it becomes our painful duty to enter into the list with those who, from mistaken views, or from corrupt motives, have endeavored to injure our reputation, that they might bask in the smiles of an adoring multitude; and domineer over them for their own advantage.

I hold the person who accuses me of Unitarianism, or of deliberately handling the word of God deceitfully in translation or any other way, a malignant slanderer, under whatever pretext or from whatever apparent good motives he may do it.

No person who has ever examined my writings can honestly accuse me of Unitarianism any more than of Deism, Mormonism, or Shakerism. And if he have not examined my writings it is still worse to affirm that of which he is ignorant. And unless Dr. Peters and Mr. Landis, when they have heard my defence from these most foul and unfounded imputations, shall make the amende honorable, I, not only I, but this community will place them amongst defamers and calumniators of the foulest water.

Neither they nor any other persons can long stand before this community in a favorable attitude, who presume to outrage truth and candor by such imputations. Our denomination have no other translation than the common one as authoritative in all matters of controversy. They appeal to it as sovereign arbiter in all discussions, and to none else. But of all these matters in due time and place. We shall continue our review next number.

A. C.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME III.——NUMBER XI.

BETHANY, VA. *NOVEMBER*, 1839.

A REVIEW OF A REVIEW.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 504.]

THE Reviewer next gives what he calls his direct arguments against Campbellism. He commences an argument against faith, as "the belief of the naked facts recorded in the gospel," by relating a fable about some young woman reported in Mr. Jennings' book, most fallaciously called "a Debate on Campbellism." In his usual blundering style he proceeds to prove that faith is not "a mere naked assent to the truth of the facts mentioned in the gospel." I would not trust a cause worth one dollar in the hands of a Lawyer who had no more discrimination than to confound "the belief of naked facts" with a "mere naked assent to the truth of facts." The belief of naked facts is simply "the belief of facts;" but the mere naked assent to the truth of facts is assent without confidence, without consent, without any sort of interest in the matter. The belief of naked facts, and naked assent are just as different as the seizing of a naked person is different from a naked person's seizing another. Mr. Landis argues as if it were one and the same to affirm that *'John seized William only,'* and that *'only John seized William'!!* Such precisely is the acuteness of my learned reviewer. I never read a more clumsy, senseless, and unmeaning description of faith than that given by Mr. L. With him faith is not this, nor that, nor any thing else; but what it is. And that he cannot, and consequently does not tell. With me, faith is the belief of the glorious facts of the gospel—a firm persuasion that they are true, which persuasion is always accompanied with confidence in them and a hearty consent of the mind to them. The man that merely assents to them, and does not confide in them, and give himself up to them, is, with me, an infidel, rather than a disciple of Christ. Let me say for

the thousandth time, with me religion is a *personal thing*. It is a person believing a person, confiding in a person, loving a person, hoping in a person, rejoicing in a person, and obeying that person. It is not an assent to a theory, or a fact; but it is a person believing, trusting, loving, obeying, and rejoicing in a person—viz. Jesus Christ. Away with such nonsense as Mr. L. puts into my mouth, and into his own! He neither understands himself, myself, nor the Apostles on this subject. It is a bold attempt at traducing and slandering a person of whose views he is grossly, shamefully—I wish I could not say, wilfully ignorant.

His direct arguments against what he calls our views of baptism, regeneration, &c. are—

1. Infants, dying in infancy, are not saved; or if saved, they are saved without regeneration.

2. So are Paidobaptists.

3. A believing penitent, if he cannot get to the water, is lost forever.

4. This scheme places the salvation of men in the hands of men, and at the mercy of the administrator.

5. That men must be regenerated before they believe the Bible, and and can never loose the grace of regeneration.

6. It is contrary to 1 Peter i. 2.

7. Mary, and the sick of the palsy, and the dying thief, had their sins remitted.

8. Cornelius was not baptized when God sent an angel to him.

9. The Lord opened Lydia's heart.

10. Simon Magus believed and was baptized, and yet not saved, though truly regenerate, &c.

11. Salvation came to the house of Zaccheus.

12. This system makes Paul an unconverted man after the Lord had said, "*Behold he prayeth.*"

13. Paul thanked God that he baptized none of the Corinthians, but some seven or eight persons.

14. Paul thanked God, therefore, that he baptized but a few persons.

15. Paul says Christ "sent him not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." Therefore he sent him not to convert men! because, forsooth, Paul had no one to baptize them!! and he dare not baptize, because not sent!!

The entire strength of this Grecian phalanx of 15 has been routed times without number already; but on the present occasion it is entirely demolished by the suicidal hands of their present commander in chief, the Rev. Mr. Landis. In saying that no person can be saved who *refuses* to be baptized after he has learned that it is a command of

Christ, as we have already shown from his own words to be his belief, he says, 'No person is saved, converted, or regenerated that is not baptized.' He is compelled to take this ground by my side, and be hewn to pieces by his own phalanx. Has any of my readers as little perception as my reviewer, and therefore ask how this can be—I answer that Mr. Landis, in making baptism essential to salvation in all such cases, (and I make it essential only in such cases as he does,) maintains that all such unbaptized persons are unconverted and unregenerate, or that converted and regenerated persons cannot be saved! "Alas! how are the mighty fallen and the weapons of war perished!" Haman, it seems, was not the only man in the world that erected a scaffold for himself. If there be a particle of sense in those quibbles about the word *convert*, which indeed are beneath the dignity of criticism as far as they are beneath the dignity of a Christian minister, they are as destructive of their author's system as much as mine—inasmuch as already shown from his own pen, he and I make baptism essential to salvation only in all the same cases—and here we both use the word *salvation* in the same sense—i. e. as pertaining to a future state. How many converted and regenerated persons, on Mr. L.'s hypothesis and logic, must go to perdition! All those indeed who believe baptism to be a command of Christ, and are not baptized. I am happy to understand that Mr. L. is an immersed Presbyterian, and therefore goes for immersion as baptism; and with me he says, 'There is but one Lord, one faith, and one baptism!' So ends the direct argument against Campbellism!

"UNITARIANISM OF THE CAMPBELLITES."

Mr. Landis under this head insults this whole community with the following most foul, malevolent, and unfounded declarations:—"I do not mean to be understood that every individual is either an avowed Arian or Socinian; *but that the majority are such.*" A more wicked falsehood was never uttered. I do not know one avowed Arian—one avowed Socinian in all our ranks. Again, "Mr. Jameson, of the Methodist Episcopal church, at Mount Holly, in Kentucky, compelled him [myself] to acknowledge that he did not believe Jesus Christ to be the Supreme God." This is also as flagitious a falsehood as the preceding. I never met Mr. Jameson at Mount Holly in my life. I saw him once in Mount Sterling, Ky.; and on his asking me whether I "believed that Jesus Christ was the Supreme God," my reply was, that I always spoke of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit in the language of the Book—that the scriptures no where called Jesus Christ "the Supreme God;" but "*the Son of God.*" But while I repudiated the term *Supreme* as applied to God; because there is no

inferior God, I had no conception of any Divinity that was not supreme; and while I believe that the Divinity of the Messiah was as supreme as that of the Father, it was an item of that reformation for which I plead; and therefore my custom to call "Bible things by Bible names." What a perversion, then, for effect, is such a representation as that of Mr. Landis. Why did he not quote some passage from some of my writings on this subject? He has not quoted one!

In proof of my Unitarianism and that of our brethren, next comes as a witness, the Rev. Obadiah Jennings—"Amongst the Campbellites I asserted during the debate with Mr. Campbell, and still do assert without fear of contradiction, are found not only avowed Arians, but *most of the infidels, and semi-infidels or free-thinkers of our country.*" If Mr. Jennings ever wrote that sentence the Lord did not permit him to publish it: he was called to judgment before it was published; and I would not for the whole universe appear before the Supreme Judge of the living and the dead with such a lie upon my tongue. I do not, however, believe he wrote it; but a very irresponsible little nephew of his published that, and a good many other infamous tales, which he sold for 75 cents, under the delusive and false title of a "Debate on Campbellism," which has fallen still-born from the press: for it was too gross a tissue of falsehood for any decent Presbyterian in America, who knows any thing of our views, our writings, or our history. No man of character will quote that "Debate" in any thing pertaining to my views. It is as great a fraud and imposition as was ever printed in America.

Mr. Landis quotes the following sentiment, which I believe I have written. He calls it "insane." "There is much strife and division in the Christian world. This I attribute to false teaching. Crime and infidelity are on an alarming increase. This I charge on the pulpit."—This is "indecent" and "insane." Be it so: I am neither afraid nor ashamed to avow it. Who has made divisions? The laity! No; but the ministry. Isaiah was *indecent* and *insane* when he said, "The leaders of this people cause them to err; and they that are led of them are destroyed." "Oh! my people, they that lead thee cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy paths." Jesus, too, comes under the condemnation of Mr. Landis: for he said, "You (scribes, elders, and leaders of the people,) make void the word of God by your traditions." "You shut the kingdom of heaven against men:" "You neither enter in yourselves, nor permit them who would, to enter." How indecent! How insane! "Paine himself, in the whole compass of his *Age of Reason*, has not ventured to employ language so scurrilous." So says the wise and decent Mr. Landis. "Woe to the pastors

that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture, saith the Lord: you have scattered my flock and driven them away." "The land is full of adulteries: because of swearing the land mourneth." "Both prophet and priest are profane; yea, in my house [the pulpit—the sacred desk] have I found their wickedness, saith the Lord."* How indecent, how insane art thou Jeremiah! I have no doubt but were such prophets to visit this land, (and perhaps the flock of some of my orthodox calumniators,) they would speak in the same style as *did* Jeremiah of his orthodox brethren.

Next comes the author of the Mirror—Dr. Thomas, I trow; of whom Mr. Landis says, "I have heard him ridicule in public assemblies the destructive doctrines of Trinitarianism in such language as the following:"—"The doctrine of the Trinity deluged the streets of Constantinople with blood." &c. If he said so, of which I may be permitted to doubt after the specimens of the love of truth which my reviewer, rather *calumniator*, has furnished—I am not responsible for it, any more than Professor Stuart, of Andover, is chargeable with the maliciousness, recklessness, and falsehoods of Mr. Landis.

But a union was effected, some years since, in Kentucky, between certain portions of the people called "*Christians*," and the brethren united with us; and we announced in the Harbinger such a union, observing that "*these brethren now go for the apostolic institutions.*" Had these persons all been *Unitarian* in the fullest sense of the word, and united with us on the ground of the *apostolic institutions alone*, does this prove that we are Unitarian for fraternizing with them, or meeting them on these principles? I never did, and I believe they never did, fraternize with Arianism, Socinianism, Sabellianism, or any other *ism;* but, in fact, upon a renunciation of all *isms* on their part and ours, and meeting on the apostolic foundation. Roman Catholics, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists, Deists, Sceptics, Quakers and Baptists have united with us in hundreds and in thousands. Does that prove that we are Romanists, Presbyterians, Methodists, Deists, &c. &c.! No more proves it that we are Unitarians because some of these also have united with us!!

Some of those called "*Christians*," both in the East and the West, have denounced their old brethren in unmeasured terms for their apostacy, and have dragooned myself and brethren as Trinitarian, Calvinistic, and orthodox beyond endurance; and have shut their presses, their pulpits, and their houses against us, because of our erroneous sentiments.

* Jeremiah xxii. 1-11.

Our calumniating reviewer next gives a variety of quotations from works which I never read, quoted, nor approved, as proof of my Unitarianism! He has quoted from men called "Christians," that repudiate me and have written against me: he has imputed their sayings to me! Such injustice and immorality I have rarely witnessed from any man professing to fear God, and to believe in a future judgment.

To cap the climax, after having rumaged some seventeen volumes which I have published, unable to find in them all one single period which he could quote to prove me Unitarian in my views or statements, he would close the door in my face, and shut me out from the possibility of defending myself from such malignity, by informing his readers that although I should produce passages from my writings and those of my brethren in which we speak of the deity or godhead of the Messiah, in which "he is spoken of as Divine, as God," &c.—yet we do not mean what we say: nay, the pious readers of Mr. L.'s review are "guarded from being entrapped by the equivocal phraseology of a disguised Unitarian;" and thus I must be forever doomed, without the possibility of explanation or defence, to endure the false and nefarious imputations of a recreant calumniator.

Now I have no more doubt than that I write this sentence, that Mr. L. knew when he wrote his review that I am no more *Unitarian*, in the sectarian acceptation of that word, than Professor Stuart of the Andover School—in fact, that I both believe and teach the supreme divinity of the Lord Jesus, if I may be permitted to use a scholastic phrase.

But I have repudiated certain words and phrases as barbarous, as unintelligible, as unscriptural—indeed, as consecrated nonsense: such as 'trinitarian,' 'unitarian,' 'eternal generation,' 'eternal filiation,' 'eternally begotten,' 'eternal procession,' 'eternal Son,' 'consubstantial.' I reject these words, and all of the same category, as of the language—the corrupt dialect of Babylon the Great I do not profess to be Arian, Socinian, Unitarian, Trinitarian, Sabellian, Arminian, Calvinian, &c. I am a disciple and an humble follower of the Son of God: I believe him never to have been created by any being: I believe him to be the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth: I believe that "in the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God: all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made: and the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory: for all things were made by him and for him, and he is before all things, and by him all things consist:" that he had a glory with his Father before the world was: that though he were rich, he made himself poor: he is the Alpha and

the Omega—the First and the Last—the Beginning and the End—the Root and the Offspring of David—his Son and his Lord: "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thine hands: they shall perish, but thou remainest: they all shall wax old as a garment, and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail." "I heard ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, saying with a loud voice, Worthy is THE LAMB THAT WAS SLAIN to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing! And every creature which is in heaven and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever! And the four living creatures, full of eyes before and behind, and the four-and-twenty elders fell down and worshipped Him that liveth forever and ever." To all which I say *Amen*, and *Amen!!* Is this Unitarianism or Trinitarianism? I care not: it is my *ism*, my religion, and my joy.

I have on many occasions, two of which occur to my memory at this moment, fully expressed my dissatisfaction both with Unitarianism and Trinitarianism, as falling short of the glory, and honor, and majesty of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—an essay on the phrase, "THE WORD OF GOD," *Christian Baptist*, p. 333, Burnet's edition; also, a letter to Elder Henry Grew, *Millennial Harbinger*, vol. iv. p. 134, and subsequent correspondence with him on this subject. I shall quote a single passage from my letter dated April, 1833. To arrest attention it is headed "Trinitarianism, Arianism, and Socianism:"—

"I must be born again, and be endowed with other reasoning powers, and have another revelation, before I can become an Arian. I will give you one reason out of a hundred, and but one, because I feel that it alone, if I had not another, would forever preclude the hypothesis: it is, in one sentence, Because the Arian philosophy converts the wisdom of God into folly.

"If I am asked to explain how this can be, I refuse not. The Arian toils and sweats, and taxes his ingenuity to show what a glorious creature the Son of God was in his pre-existent state. He fancies and represents the Son as filling some intermediate rank more than midway between the Arch Seraphim and the Deity. He thinks he devoutly consults the honor of the Son, when he finds for him some vacant throne, near to the Self-existent and Eternal, beyond the aspirations of the cherubim and seraphim. There he places him, a sort of sub-deity, whence he descends to become incarnate. Yet, strange to tell, when this first and high-born One, of unrivalled glory amongst the creatures of God, appears in human flesh, *he gives him nothing to do, which the son of Joseph could not have done as well!!!* Was ever folly more con-

summate! What is folly, but the adoption of inadequate means to ends? Is it not folly to give a diamond for a straw?—to raise a tempest to move a feather?—to discharge the artillery of heaven against a worm?—to hurl the thunderbolts of Omnipotence against a fly?—to despatch the Arch Angel on an errand which the son of Joseph could have as well performed?

"What creature could do more than Abel, Moses, John the Baptist, Stephen, Peter, Jamesthe Just, or Paul did—tell the truth, the whole truth, lead an exemplary life, and as a martyr offer up his soul to God!*

"What, let me again ask, is folly, if this be not folly? To waste resources, or squander means, is as foolish as not to provide them. He who provides the materials for a palace, and buids a cottage, is as very a simpleton as he who attempts to build a palace out of the materials of a tent. Could not Gabriel, who waited on Daniel on the banks of Ulai; nay, could not Paul himself, do as much for the redemption of the world, as the Arian Son of God? When some philosopher appears, who with a dash of his pen can blot out sin, or show me that the tears of the penitent, or the blood of bulls and goats can wash it from the universe, then, but not till then, will I turn Arian.

"For the same, or a similar reason, I cannot be a *Socinian*. This is but a new edition of the fable—the mountain's in labor, and a mouse is born. Heaven taught sages, legislators, kings, prophets, priests, and seers, for four thousand years, filled with the spirit of wisdom and revelation, exhaust all the similitudes, analogies, and imagery of this creation; impoverish the eloquence of heaven and earth, all figures and forms of speech, to raise the expectations of mankind in anticipation of a wonderful child, on whose shoulders the government of the universe was to remain, whose name was written, "Wonderful Counsellor—the Mighty God—the Father of Eternity—the Prince of Peace—Immanuel:" yet when the prediction is accomplished, Mary travails, and the carpenter's son is born—a Son of God, it is true, as Adam was!!!

"With me, consistency must precede faith. I must see types, figures, prophecies, promises, harmonising; I must see the means and the end correspondent; I must see wisdom, power, goodness; justice, mercy, love; condescension, truth, and holiness, shining in all the splendors

* "We cannot give our reasons *in extenso* for any of the more important conclusions suggested in these remarks. On this point we shall offer one. In our judgment it matters not whether we regard the sacrifice of Christ as a mere display of love, or as a sin offering, that God might be just in justifying him that believeth On either hypothesis, the Arian or Socinian system is wholly at fault. For should we, with the Arian, imagine that Jesus, as to his pre existent state, was a creature, however exalted, it avails nothing; because the distance between any creature and his Creator is so immense (infinite I was going to say,) that all the creation might stand between, and yet no nearer approach to Deity. Now if Jesus never was, as to his celestial origin, more than a creature, he could, as a sin-offering, effect nothing more than any other creature: his life and death were all due to his Creator on his own account. Gabriel never can do more than his own duty. But on the other hypothesis, that his death was a mere display of love, in what, let me ask, does this love consist? To Omnipotence and Omniscience the creation of any one creature is as easy as another It required no more or greater effort on the part of the *Almighty* to create Gabriel than an eagle— this most illustrious creature than a sparrow. and how would the text read, "God so loved the word that he gave ——— for its redemption!!!" May I not infer, then, that the Arian philosophy converts the wisdom of God into folly? The Socinian, who calls Jesus *divine*, and some others who call him a *divine* person, because of the gifts of the Holy Spirit bestowed on him, might, in their interpretation of the word *divine*, find room for Balaam's ass; because that ass was under such plenary inspiration as to have the words suggested, and to speak with the gift of tongues, when it reproved the madness of the Prophet and preached reformation to him. Assuredly it was, in *their* vocabulary, a *divine* ass!"

of Divinity, before I can subscribe to any proposition touching the personal dignity and standing of my Lord the King.

"It will not suffice to puzzle me with hard questions about how this can be, since my faith has in its infancy to master the master truth of revelation—to admit that God is *Jehovah;* or, that God was, and always is, the self-existent, immutable and eternal, never-began-to-be, the eternal inhabitant of eternity. Believing this, I find no difficulty in believing that there was, and is, and evermore shall be, society and plurality —a literal *I*, and *thou*, and *he*—a *we*, and *our*, and *us*, in *one divine nature*. This to me is as easy as the idea of SELF-EXISTENT; yea, more easy when *I*, and *thou*, and *he* deliberate on creation, providence, and redemption. I cannot, for my life, even fancy a nature destitute of *I*, and *thou*, and *he*. I am certain it is not the human—I am certain it is not the angelic—certain, too, that it is not the divine.

"In our nature there is no more than I, and thou, and he, as respects primary relation. There is no more in the angelic, and the Bible reveals no more than I, and thou, and he in the divine. But not turning aside to answer objections which are anticipated, be it observed that I make not this a matter of inference only; for there is an association of the name of the Father, of the Son, and the Holy Spirit in the revealed relation of the three persons, I, thou, and he, and just in the dignity of these three. "I send thee," "I and thou send him," "Jehovah and his Spirit has sent me." On this principle the Christian economy is arranged and developed. So I read the volumes of revelation."

After reading and pondering upon the above extract from a work read by many thousands, published several years since, what faith can be reposed in such men as Messrs. Jennings and Landis! I call the attention of Dr. Peters especially to this article; and demand, in the name of eternal justice, amends for the injury he has done me, in wantonly endorsing for such a presumptuous calumniator as Mr. Landis.

I am now at the last item in this most veritable and Christian review—

"THE TRANSLATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT ADOPTED BY THE CAMPBELLITES."

This part of the review is stamped with a falsehood on its forehead. There is no translation *adopted* by the people so nick-named, except that of King James. I appeal to every man of common sense and common honesty, if, in speaking of Campbell's Gospels and Macknight's Epistles, I should say, 'The Gospels und Epistles adopted by the Presbyterians,' I would tell the truth or a falsehood, because Presbyterians had given those new versions. Mr. Landis would be the first man to say I falsified in such a case. Well, then, *nomine mutato fabula narratur de te.* As he would affirm in my case, so all will affirm of him. We read in our families and churches various translations, but have adopted none as *authoritative* in deciding any question of faith or manners, except that used by all Protestant parties.

Much is said about a mistake which occurred on the title-page of the first edition of the new translation. Having always heard Jonathan Edwards, President of Princeton College, and Philip Doddridge quoted, approved, and adopted as Presbyterian authorities, I placed Doddridge on the title-page with Campbell and Macknight as Doctors of the Church of Scotland. I believe that they were communicants in common with all Presbyterian churches. Technically, however, it was an error. Still as the Congregationalists of New England were component parts of the Presbyterian church of these United States until last year, and sat in their Assembly, I hold it to be according to their own usage to identify them as members of one ecclesiastic community. I, therefore, without the slightest suspicion of any umbrage to the Presbyterians, and without any conceivable interest or advantage to my views, had, as aforesaid, placed him on the title-page with the Presbyterian Campbell and Macknight as members of the same church; much in the same way as they had placed Jonathan Edwards at the head of a Presbyterian College, as I supposed.

But why assail my motives and arraign my moral character for so doing! What gain or interest had I in this affair? Mr. Landis will tell you:—"After Mr. Campbell had proclaimed Dr. Doddridge to be a Presbyterian, he cites him as an important and weighty authority; and one, of course, whose candor had got the better of his Presbyterian principles, to sustain the rendering which his book gives of *ekklesia*—viz. *congregation*, instead of that given in the common translation."

Let us now honestly examine this matter. We took but the Acts of the Apostles and the Apocalypse from Doddridge; the four Gospels from Campbell; and the Epistles from Macknight. We quoted Doddridge *once* in a critical note upon the word *ekklesia;* but we also gave Dr. Campbell in the same note in sustaining the same view of the term; as also Thompson. I did not, indeed, at the time know the particular views of Doddridge on ecclesiastical government: I simply regarded him as a Calvinist whose works were every where read and commended by Presbyterians. As to any gain to my views from his remarks on *ekklesia*, I do not hold myself or my readers indebted to him the millionth part of a grain. For, as my readers are often shown in my notes, I regarded Doddridge as of little or no critical authority—generally, if not always, preferring Drs. Campbell and Macknight to him, in passages which they had in common translated.

I had, then, in fact no motive nor temptation under heaven to assign Doddridge any other branch of the church than that which he occupied. Nor is the New Version in the least indebted to his peculiar views of

church polity for a single sentence that is not sustained by Presbyterian authority. After this candid statement of the matter, now listen to Mr. Landis:—"In what estimation can the Christian public hold a man, who will, for the sake of promoting the sale of a book, be guilty of such dissimulation." I request the reader to ponder well upon the preceding question, with an especial reference, not only to the history I have given, but also in regard to Mr. Landis himself.

In the same paragraph he says, "It was not until Mr. Campbell had published several large editions of this book, that he would consent to correct the false statement in its title-page, declaring Dr. Doddridge to be a member of the Church of Scotland." Now, with the above question in his eye, what will the reader think when informed that this is a downright and wilful falsehood! *It was corrected in the second edition!* Yes, believe me, courteous reader, but one single edition of some two thousand copies was issued from the press till the error was corrected. Before the close of the second edition I ascertained the fact that Dr. Doddridge, though a Calvinist, and orthodox with Presbyterians, communed especially with what is now properly called the New School—then the Congregational branch.

May I not now ask, How could any man fearing God and regarding truth, write and publish in the *American Biblical Repository* that Mr. Campbell would not consent to correct the above statement "until he had published *several large editions* of the book?" Christian reader, what think you of this, coming from a man who would make one an offender for a word, and seek to blast his reputation for integrity? I protest I would not have my name to such a wilful falsehood as the above for all the new versions in America. In the name of outraged truth and common decency, what could have tempted this man to invent such a fable, when, in the *errata* to the SECOND *edition*, published in 1828, the correction is made? If any one can reduce this attempt to injure my character to a better category than deliberate dissimulation and falsehood, I shall be thankful to be relieved from the unhappy feelings which such daring presumption has called into existence.

But he is not content with this nefarious thrust at my reputation; but proceeds to say—"As our examination must seriously affect the moral character of this gentleman, we invite attention to another point before we take up the subject directly." This shows what his calculations and intentions were. Now the point and drift of some three pages is to show that "corrections and improvements in style," *as alleged by us*, have been made in the original works of Campbell, Macknight, and Doddridge, in our last editions of the New Version—"*yet still retaining its original title-page.*" This "retaining of the original title page"

he calls "a dishonest artifice"—"a crime in no way differing from actual forgery"—"for the sake of speculating upon the credulity of the public." Worse and worse! Not content with the invention and publication of one palpable falsehood, our *Reverend* Reviewer becomes more and more fluent in the work of detraction and wilful misrepresentation. In one word, three entire pages of unmeasured abuse are based upon the falsehood that certain alleged improvements are found in the various late editions of the work—still issued under, and "retaining its original title-page." Any one may see that there is no foundation for this mistatement! The facts known and read of all men who choose to examine, are—1st. In the *errata* to the 2d edition Dr. Doddridge is declared to have been a Congregationalist; and, 2d. in the next edition and every subsequent one a NEW TITLE *is affixed to the work.* The original title never extended beyond the second edition!! O truth! O honesty! whither, whither have you fled! This is the gentleman who says it is "insane" and "indecent" to impute to the pulpit immorality and crime!! Reader, open the 3d edition and compare its *title* with the original one. Observe that it adds to the original title the following: "*With various emendations.*" Besides, to the appendices are added, "Critical Notes on the Language, Geography, Chronology, and History of the New Testament; and Miscellaneous Tables," &c. "By A. Campbell: 1832." These attempts at assassination—at the massacre of my reputation, are so diabolically perverse in appearance, that until some person arises who can explain them upon some honorable principle unknown to me, I can look upon the author of this review with no other feelings than those of unaffected scorn and contempt. Still, as Dr. Peters has endorsed for Mr. Landis, I shall go on to review his review of the text of the New Version.

Mr. Landis next collects from my pocket edition of said Testament the *spurious readings*, which, on the authority of Griesbach and others, are rejected; and, without any ceremony, reiterates his former slanders. He would fain impress his readers that Mr. Campbell "has followed in the steps of the Unitarian editors of the Improved Version." The venom of the Old Serpent may hereafter be expected in all that is said of the New Version. After what has appeared, we are prepared for any thing. We have neither time nor necessity to justify a particular reference to these readings. I will only say, that there is not one spurious reading rejected from the common text that even squints to the pending controversies between Trinitarians and Unitarians, that is not regarded as spurious by some of the most learned Trinitarians, living and dead, who have spoken of these things.

The motive of Mr. Landis to fix upon myself and the New Version

an uncertain character, is so obvious that he who runs may read. His use, or rather abuse of the spurious readings enumerated in the Appendix, is dictated by this benevolent desire. He has, however, found that the table of spurious readings is larger than the actual excisions from the text; a matter of which we may speak more fully at another time. Errors of this sort are found in all the Bibles in the land. Even in the single Epistle to the Romans, from the Andover press; and after the most patient supervision of Professor Stuart himself, and the most accomplished proof-reader, an entire verse is left out; and, if I mistake not, it has not yet been noticed by any one of that school. From whatever motive typographical omissions and errors are corrected, I am always glad. It is fortunate in this case that the omissions noticed by Mr. Landis are in favor of the common version.

On the subject of spurious readings Mr. L. is manifestly not the most competent authority in the world. He has yet to learn that while we have a standard royal translation, there is no standard royal original. The common version is not according to any one ancient manuscript—is not according to any standard or received original in the world. It is a translation of a patch-work original. "It is," says one deeply learned in biblical criticism—a truly enlightened man on such questions—"it is a very singular anomaly, that, although we have, by public authority, a standard English version; yet there exists no standard Greek text for the *original of that version.* No principal printed editions of the Greek correspond exactly throughout, and none of them have been printed *verbatim* from any ancient manuscript; but each has been varied by critical alterations of its learned editor, on his own responsibility; on which account all the great collators of manuscripts have judged it necessary to apprise their readers, in the first instance, by what particular printed edition they have made their respective collations. Thus Birch states, *in limine*, that he collated by *Stephen's* 3d edition, 1550; Bentley's collations were made by the text of Erasmus, 3d edition, 1522, as reprinted at Strasburgh in 1794, by W. Cephalaeus. Other collators have also specified the editions by which they compared. One of the most ardent defenders of the common version, and much more learned than Mr. Landis, has been constrained to admit this fact in "The British Critic and Quarterly Theological Review, and Ecclesiastical Record.*

Before we treat at large upon spurious readings, it were desirable to decide what text ought to be translated; and that the commonly received Greek text is not of that character is very obvious now-a-days to

* London, July, 1837, No. 43.

all learned and candid men. "Reception," says the same distinguished critic—

"Mere *reception* can impart no real authority whatever. *Reception* can cause the currency of a false coin, until it is discovered; but it cannot ever communicate *standard value*. It is the same in the case under our consideration: '*Quod a principio validum fuit, tractu temporis non convalescit.*' It is delusion in sacred criticism to appeal for evidence to an '*editio princeps*,' or to the '*most ancient* printed editions.' We know that Erasmus's *first edition* of the Greek, printed in 1516, is the '*editio princeps*,' and basis of the '*textus receptus*;' yet we also know that that first edition was only a transcript from one of the few manuscripts he was able to procure, not one of which was an *uncial* manuscript; or older than the tenth century: 'nos, in *prima* recognitione (he says,) *quatuor* Græcis adjuti sumus; in secunda *quinque*.' That first printed text, successively corrected by himself, by R. Stephens, by Beza, and finally by Elzivir, according as more and more ancient copies were discovered and consulted, constitutes the common or '*received text*;' but it became '*received*,' not from the establishment of a final and decisive authority, but altogether from the necessity of the case. However venerable, therefore, Erasmus's first edition may appear on a shelf, as a monument of the first printing of the Greek text, we know perfectly well that it is the *worst* edition; because, he altered its text in each of his four succeeding editions, in the last of which he had obtained only eight *junior* manuscripts. The same reasoning is to be applied to all the 'early-printed editions:' they cannot have more authority than the manuscripts on which they are founded, and whose contents they echo; and we *now* know those manuscripts.

"The case, therefore, of the New Scriptures, with respect to printed authority, is exactly the reverse of that of all classical works. The manuscripts from which the latter have been printed are very few, and still fewer have been discovered since the first editions were printed; so that the succeeding editions have been almost entirely reprints from the first editions. To those first editions, therefore, appeal is reasonably made, as possessing an *ultimate* authority, or the nearest to the manuscripts which are practically inaccessible. The '*princeps*,' and earliest printed editions of the *New Testament*, were also printed from few manuscripts; but, since they were printed, a multitudinous store of other manuscripts have gradually and openly disclosed themselves, in almost every country of Christendom; some of them far more ancient, and therefore more authoritative, than those which produced the first printed editions; diffusing a continually increasing light over them, and exposing numberless defects in each of them. The *princeps* edition, as we have seen, was formed on *four* manuscripts of no great antiquity: by the latest census, we now have knowledge of between *six and seven hundred* manuscripts of the whole, or portions of the evangelical Scriptures; which were unknown to the digester and editor of the *princeps editio*, or even to the digester of the *textus receptus*. It is rendering no service, therefore, to scripture, or to truth, to strive to maintain a reading merely because it is a '*received*' reading; such pertinacity is of nearer affinity to bigotry and blind conformity, than to sound judgment, and an earnest anxiety for the truth."

The accessions to the stock of ancient manuscripts have opened immense sources of biblical criticism unknown to James' translators in 1611. A flood of light in Greek literature and biblical criticism has burst upon the world since those days:—

"The only printed editions of the Greek, at the date of the last authorized revision, in 1611, were those of Card. Ximenes, printed at Complutum in 1514, published in 1522; Erasmus, printed and published in 1515, '19, '22, '27, '35; Stephens, printed and published in 1536, '49, '50, '51, '69; Beza, printed and published in 1565, '76, '82, '89; and the several editions printed from these.

"The first of the Elzivir editions (which are regarded as the general standard of the *received* Greek text) was not printed until 1624; that is, thirteen years after the publication of our present authorised English version; so that the latest printed Greek text which its revisers could have consulted, was that of Beza; consequently, it has not received the benefits of the editions of Elzivir, Mill, Wetstein, Matthæi, London Polyglott, Bengel, Griesbach, Birch, &c.; and yet it is by these later editions only, that we have at length acquired a thorough knowledge of the *actual state of the original text.*

"And this consideration supplies a commanding reason why a new translation, in our present knowledge of the actual state of that text would not only be advisable, but would be a positive waste of time and labor; which reason is this, that there is no printed Greek text that affords a certain standard for translation."

Is it not strange that notwithstanding this influx of light, we should be superstitiously walking by the comparatively feeble glimmerings of the slender tapers of some three or four manuscripts of the tenth century. Such, however, is the fact. There is a most singular adhesiveness to the faults and errors of the common version, and a reluctance to have them removed, bordering upon the obstinate bigotry of a Jew or a Turk. We are really degenerating in this department since the days of James I; for, from the days of Tyndale's version, in 1525, to that of King James, the translation was *revised* four times by public authority, "as the Reformation opened new stores of manuscript documents, giving a new revision for every twenty-two years: whereas during two hundred and twenty-eight years, the interval from 1611 till now, (within which time a far greater number of manuscript documents, and of higher antiquity and greater authority, have been disclosed to the Christian world,) no new revisal or correction has been undertaken by public authority." I wonder how such men as Mr. Landis and Dr. Peters contemplate such facts as these, or whether they contemplate them at all. If they do, surely they could not have so exposed themselves in this rash and perverse review.

But what is the head and front of my offending? I know no better now than when I issued the first edition of the New Version. Had I

courted reputation or profit from this undertaking, I would not then have sinned against myself by translating *baptism* by *immersion*. This word *immersion!*——Oh! what an offence against the decency and pride of Presbyterianism! A sin that can never be expiated, not even by massacreing my reputation—making me Unitarian, and I know not what, or how many other infamous things! This, I doubt not, is the secret of the whole matter.

Mr. Landis cannot possibly believe me Unitarian. After having eagerly, but in vain, examined my writings for grounds and evidences against me, I am persuaded he cannot for a moment entertain such a thought. I have found him misquoting, perverting, mutilating, and changing even the quotations from the New Version, as well as boldly asserting most gross and palpable falsehoods, until, I am sorry to say, I can have no confidence in his honesty whatever. I could not in a volume expose all his efforts at fraud and imposition in his strictures on the New Version. For example, he represents me as studiously expunging from the text of the Apocalypse, chap. i. 11., "I am Alpha and Omega," in order to destroy the deity of the Saviour; because in that place I allege it an interpolation—whilst he must have known, had he looked, that *twice* in the same book, and in the same sense, that same phrase is found in company with the Lord Jesus; chap. xxi. 6. xxii. 13. Many such frauds may be detected on his pages.

This is not the time, nor the place, to propound arguments in favor of a new and improved version, or of a review of the common version of the inspired volume. The *facts* already stated on these pages furnish good, and, in my judgment, conclusive reasons for such a revision.

We have no standard Greek text, nor have we a translation made from the "received text." Wickliffe translated the *Vulgate* in 1380; Tyndale translated from the Greek through the Latin, and often followed the *Latin* where it deserted the common Greek, in 1526; Coverdale, in 1535, added Tyndale's Testament to his Bible, somewhat improved; John Rogers published a new revision under the fictitious name of Matthew, 1537; Cranmer's revision appeared in 1539; in the same year another revision by Faverner appeared, and in 1611 issued from the press the common version, falsely called "a new translation." James' *translators* revised Cranmer, with the assistance of Beza; Cranmer revised Rogers; Rogers revised Coverdale; Coverdale revised Tyndale; Tyndale revised Wickliffe by the Greek; and Wickliffe translated the Latin. This is a short, but true history of our versions, translations, *alias* revisions.

How little we have yet excelled Wickliffe, may be seen by the following comparison:—

Wicliffe's Version, A. D. 1830.

"Begynnen we therfore eftsoone to preise us-silf? or whether we neden, as summen, pistlis of preisying to ghou or of ghou? Ghe ben oure pistil writen in oure hertis which is knowen and red of alle men, and maad open. For ghe ben the pistle of Crist mynystrid of us, and writen, not with enke, but bi the spyryt of the lyvyng God: not in stoonene tablis, but in fleischli tablis of herte. For we han such trist bi Crist to God; not that we ben sufficient to thenke ony thing of us, as of us, but oure sufficience is of God, which also *made us able mynystris* of the Newe Testament."

Authorized Version, A. D. 1611.

"Do we begin again to commend ourselves? or need we, as some *others*, epistles of commendation to you, or *letters* of commendation from you? Ye are our epistle written in our hearts, known and read of all men. *Forasmuch as ye are* manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written, not with ink, but with the spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshly tables of the heart. And such trust have we through Christ to God-ward: not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing, as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God, who also hath *made us able ministers* of the New Testament."

I believe much more in private than in public versions. There is too much of the spirit of concession—of going for your translation of a particular passage, if you go for mine. Every one knows this that knows any thing about conventional proceedings. Compromise and concession are indispensable in making Translations as in making Constitutions: therefore, one man like Dr. George Campbell—candid, learned, impartial—is, with me, better authority than the King's "*forty-nine*," with the King himself, who is said to have been the fiftieth, and sometimes to have had a casting vote, at least on some difficult points. I have much to say on this subject, and the times and the seasons seem to require it; but we must defer it to another occasion.

But to return to the Unitarianism of the New Version. I have courage, I presume, in the estimation of all men who know me, to divulge and maintain whatever I believe to be divine truth, at any risk or hazard. One that could, at the age of 24, renounce proud, opulent, and popular Presbyterianism, in the midst of the thickest and strongest Presbyterian population in America, and sit down with a dozen or two poor obscure persons, and break the loaf among them for many years, in the midst of the continual fires of proscription and persecution—could not, one would think, now be easily intimidated to profess candidly and above-board his convictions of truth, even however unpopular it might be. If I disbelieved in the existence of the Deity, or

personality of the Father, the Son, or the Holy Spirit, or in the absolute necessity and all-sufficiency of his sacrifice for our sins, I would avow it in a moment in the presence of Dr. Peters and Mr. Landis, and all the Divines and Colleges in America.

The efforts of my old uncandid and unappeasable brethren to prostrate my influence as a teacher of truth, and a pleader for reformation, by these violent and unfounded assaults only demonstrates my invulnerability on my own principles. Could they meet the real A— C—, they would not have to create a more vulnerable one. But when they have killed the fictitious—the Arian, Socinian, Unitarian A— C—, I would have them know that the true and real A— C— yet lives and triumphs, unscathed, unhurt by all their puny and malevolent endeavors.

It would be wholly out of place to enter into an exposition of the spurious, or of the various readings of disputed passages found in the common version and rejected in the new. One concession made by Mr. Landis himself, shows how little is lost to the cause of orthodoxy itself by the rejection of all the spurious and disputed passages of the book. "It is admitted on all hands," says he, "that no doctrine is essentially affected either by the rejection or retaining of all the readings of Mill, Griesbach, &c., put together." According to all the oracles of common sense, then, may I not ask the reader to notice how thoroughly Mr. L. has refuted his own efforts to fix upon the New Version an injurious character by the rejection of those passages to which he alludes; when he admits that the rejection of all the readings of Mill, Griesbach, &c., "essentially affects not any doctrine in the book." Well then, if, as he alleges, I have not rejected even all these from the text, it would seem that the New Version is perfectly safe to all readers, so far as Unitarianism is concerned, Mr. L. himself being judge. Thus Mr. L. has neutralized his own anathemas, by affirming that these expurgations cannot essentially affect the doctrine of the Trinity or any other cardinal doctrine of the Christian system.

His attempts to blast the reputation of Griesbach, or to hand him over to the Unitarians, is as weak as it is wicked. The world is, perhaps, more indebted to this learned and distinguished professor and critic, than to any other critic on the long list of collators, interpreters, and editors of the New Testament. He would unceremoniously hand him over to the Unitarians, because his honesty occasionally breaks in upon some proof-texts of my very learned reviewer. No man of learning and candor, known to me, acquainted with Griesbach's labors and character, has ever suspected him of Unitarianism. For my part, I know of no evidence of it; nor does Mr. Landis produce a single proo

of it. I have a very poor opinion of that Christian morality which so unceremoniously assaults the reputation of every man who happens to dissent from our favorite dogmata. Such a character is not that of Thomas Hartwell Horne, in whose "Introduction" Griesbach fills so large and conspicuous a place.

I am, indeed, of opinion, to use with approbation the words of Mr. Landis, that "all the alterations contended for do not affect, either *pro* or *con*, one single article of the Christian system." I have gone farther: I have said that I never saw any version or translation of the Christian Scriptures, Latin, German, French, or English—Romanist or Protestant—ancient or modern, from which any honest man of plain common sense might not learn the way to heaven, to holiness, and happiness with unerring certainty, if he applied his mind to it. They all name the same persons, places, and events—record the same facts—narrate the same parables, comparisons, conversations, and deliver the same precepts and promises. They may, indeed, differ much in their plainness, perspicuity, and easy intelligence; but the same story is told in all its characteristic attributes and circumstances. Like different witnesses, whose testimony exactly agrees in all the facts, even to the most minute. A, B, C, and D has each his own way of telling it to the court and jury; but there is one of them whose perspicuity and precision make his testimony more intelligible and comprehensible than that of all the others. So in translations: one greatly may excel another in all the attributes of clearness, simplicity, and general intelligibility.

As respects the underived godhead of my Lord and Redeemer, on the expiatory power of whose blood, as a real sin-offering, my soul reposes with ineffable delight, I rejoice that the most thorough expurgation of spurious readings—of interpolations and mistakes which I have ever seen, weakens not the evidence, detracts in no wise from the assurance given of it in the volume of inspiration. Indeed, as Macknight has shown from Calvin, Beza, and others of high repute with Protestants; some of the passages regarded as spurious now, on which many have leaned with so much confidence, were not, when fairly construed, logical proofs of the proposition in whose support they were alleged. Of this sort is the often quoted passage of 1 John v. 7. Benson and Wall both affirm that whatever may be learned from this verse may be learned from other portions of scripture, and therefore neither Trinitarians nor Arians can argue any thing peculiar from it. "These three are one *as respects the unity of their testimony*," is not only the interpretation of Macknight, but of many of the most orthodox who were never suspected of Arianism.

Indeed, the most violent efforts to force such passages into the service of a partizan view, greatly discredits the learning, the judgment, or the sincerity of its advocates. When every passage that is justly deemed spurious, or even doubted to be genuine, and when all the torturings and wresting of proof-texts are abandoned, if I cannot prove the pre-existence of the Messiah—the underived divinity of the *Logos*; that in his divine nature "he created all things"—is "before all things"—"upholds all things"—was ineffably "*rich* before the world was"—was with God before time began—was "from everlasting"—is "the Alpha and the Omega," "the First and the Last," "the Beginning and the End"—"David's Son and David's Lord"—"the Word that was in the beginning with God—that was God"—that "was made flesh"—was "God manifest in the flesh"—"the Mighty God"—"the Father of Eternity"—"the only begotten of the Father"—"the brightness of his glory"—"the express image of his person"—"Emanuel"—"God with us"—"Jehovah"—"Jesus"—I say, if I cannot demonstrate that these names, titles, honors, in their fullest, loftiest, and most sublime import, are truly and rightfully applied to the Son of Mary—the Son of God—Jesus of Nazareth, I can prove no proposition whatsoever.

Had he not been as divine as his Father—as human as his mother, he could not have offered a real sin-offering, he could not have "magnified the law and made it honorable;" he could not have justified God in justifying man; he could not have "finished transgression, made atonement for iniquity, terminated sin-offerings, and brought in an everlasting justification." He accomplished an "eternal redemption." "By one offering up of himself he has forever perfected the sanctified"—"them that obey him." To do all this is super-human, super-angelic, and divine. This is not the work of a mere creature—finite, limited, dependant; but of the supreme, unoriginated, eternal Self-Existent; humbled indeed, incarnate, in the form and capacity of a servant, the Son of God, the Son of Man, the Woman's Seed. Truly for us "a child has been born—a son has been given," whose name deservedly and appropriately is called "Wonderful Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." "The government of a universe is now on his shoulder," of "the increase of which there shall be no end." Such are a few of my views of the Divine Master, and of his incomparable work.

In a work just now issuing from the press, called "THE CHRISTIAN SYSTEM," &c, in that portion of it written this summer, I have endeavored to condense into a very small compass what has been spread over many pages on the revealed distinctions of "God, the

WORD of God, the Spirit of God;" or, in the New Covenant style, "The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." In reference to human redemption, I am persuaded that this revelation of Father, Son, and Spirit, is not only the frame-work of the whole remedial economy; and essential to atonement, reconciliation, and the remission of sin; but to such a display of divine perfections and excellencies as fully reveals the glory of God to all the intelligences of the universe; and makes him infinitely lovely, as well as supremely good and powerful—immutably true, inflexibly just, immaculately holy—as well as full of mercy and compassion, in the esteem of all who know him. This development of the Divine Being and perfections will perfect the bliss of heaven, and the misery of all that have despised and rejected the counsels of redeeming love against themselves.

The sacrificial system is itself the frame-work of the gospel. *No shedding of blood, no remission of sin,* is the plainest and most fully and emphatically developed oracle in the Bible. "A body was prepared" for the "WORD that was in the beginning with God"—"the *Living Word* that was God," for the purpose of putting away sin by the sacrifice of himself." *No sin, no incarnation—no sin-offerings, no expiation—no expiation, no remission—no remission, no salvation; and, therefore, no distinction of* FATHER, SON, *and* SPIRIT, *no redemption of man. To deny the doctrine of three names—of three relations—of three participants in one godhead is to deny the possibility of saving sinners, and of putting down sin forever.*

There have, indeed, been many ignorant, conceited, blustering Trinitarians, who have nauseated many, very many persons of good understanding and of good morals, by their uncouth, barbarous, unmeaning jargon on this subject; and by the cruel persecuting edicts by which they have sought to sustain it and to put down inquiry, or even thought upon the subject. Thus Arianism was begotten and born. Thus came Unitarianism, and Socinianism, and Sabellianism, &c. &c. These are extremes. Hence no man well read, in sacred scripture, can approve of Trinitarianism as taught in the schools, any more than of its rivals for public favor. For my own part, I have long since abandoned the corrupt style of every human system on the subject. But while I repudiate the Trinitarian as well as the Unitarian vocabulary, I do not by any means reject that style because of Unitarian predilections, or Trinitarian antipathies. I have neither: I never had. There is not one word of divine honor or glory uttered by Prophet or Apostle, concerning my Redeemer, that I would mince or interpret in a subordinate sense, more than I would in their application to God the Father. I have no idea of sub-deity or subordinate Divinity, nor of mere honorary

titles in reference to the Messiah. Such quibbling is, with me, profane trifling with sacred things. The words which the Holy Spirit has sanctioned or inspired are honest words, full of meaning, and not to be feloniously interpreted. When I am told that "all the fulness of the godhead" dwells substantially in my Saviour, I do not understand a subordinate, or partial, or imperfect fulness, but simply "*all the fullness of the godhead*," or divinity.*

Just at this place I opened Professor Stuart's Letters to Rev. Samuel Miller, D. D., of Princeton, on the doctrine of "eternal generation."—Dr. Miller goes with Turretine Gerhard and those who teach an eternal generation, or emanation of the Son from the Father, and accuses Professor Stuart of leaning to Arianism, because he denies that doctrine. Professor Stuart handsomely returns the compliment to his brother professor in the following words, which, because they are so apposite to my case, and treatment by Mr. Stuart's party, I now quote them with approbation:—

"I am unable to see any *approximation* in our opinions to Unitarianism. We do believe, there is a distinction in the Godhead, the nature of which, as you yourself justly state, p. 84, *the Scriptures have not explained*. On this distinction, (which we can hardly venture with you to explain as merely *a threefold mode of existence*, p. 84; but which we suppose may be something more than *mode of existence*,) are founded in various appellations and exhibitions of the Godhead, in the Scriptures. We believe that the Logos is truly divine; divine in a *supreme*, not in a *secondary* sense; and that the Logos did unite himself with "the holy child, that was called the Son of God," so as to form, in a manner inscrutable to us, one person; of whom could be predicated, with equal truth, a nature human and divine.

"Does your sentiment, now, offer any advantages to those who believe in the essential divinity of Christ, either in comprehending this truth, or in defending it, which are not offered by the sentiment which we embrace? I confess, for myself, I cannot help feeling, that the idea of a *derived* God is, in reality, a vastly greater approximation to Arianism, than that which we adopt; and that the antagonists of Arius had much less reason to dispute with him than they apprehended. For one, I am altogether inclined to say, with good Irenæus, "There is nothing in God which is previous or subsequent, or more ancient; consequently no emanation of this kind can take place." (Lib. ii. c. 13.) I cannot but rejoice, at finding in the disciple of Polycarp, the intimate friend of the Apostle John, ideas of God which appear to me so rational and Scriptural.

"The fathers in general, nurtured in the bosom of heathenism and emanation philosophy, and being concerned with those to whom an *emanated* God would not be objectionable, do not appear to have apprehended any thing repulsive in the doctrine of generation as to the divine nature. I am unable to accord with them here. The pure, and spiritual, and immutable nature of God, (a truth equally consonant with the Scriptures and with reason,) is so deeply impressed upon me, that I feel an instinctive repulsion to any approximation towards such an idea of the Godhead as interferes with these essential predicates. And I must confess, that with the views which I now entertain, if I could be persuaded that the doctrine of eternal *emanation* or *generation* is true, I should feel that the first step was taken towards embracing the Arian system.

"I am no *Subordinarian*, in any shape whatever, as it respects the Logos, previously to the incarnation, and in himself considered. A *subordinate God* is, to my mind, a contradiction of terms; unless the word God is used in a metaphorical sense. I believe in the *full, proper, supreme divinity of the Logos;* that he is *self-existent, uncreated, unbegotten, not emanated*. Is this approximation to "denying the Trinity and divinity of the Saviour?" If it be, I am greatly in error, and wholly unable at present to discern it."

To return to the translation. Had Mr. Landis been actuated by a truth-loving, a truth-honoring, and a truth-telling spirit, he could have shown—nay, he would have shown, that in the spurious readings

* See the "Christian System," now issuing from the press, for my views on these cardinal points.

rejected on the authority of Griesbach and others, we have repudiated those acknowledged by all to be favorable to our views, as well as those supposed by Mr. Landis to be unfavorable to them. We have, indeed, no favorite view. The whole Bible, with us, is a favorite, and all its views are ours. But we have already fully shown that nothing of this sort could be expected from one who has most wantonly accused of very glaring and flagrant errors, not only without a particle of proof, but in the face of the most clear and definite declarations to the contrary of his imputations.

It is no part of my present intention to defend the New Version, or sustain its various emendations, as we call them, that have in the course of a few editions offered themselves to public examination.—Mr. Landis has not attempted to show that they are not in truth, and in fact, emendations and improvements. He aims at putting down both the version and myself by other arguments than the merits of the "alterations" of which he speaks. His main effort consists in affirming that "the Campbellites have *adopted* a new version of the Christian Scriptures"—as, of course, more favorable to their views than the common one. 2d. That "it was not until Mr. Campbell had published *several large editions* of this book that he would consent to correct the false statement in its title-page, declaring Dr. Doddridge to be a member of the Church of Scotland." 3d. That Mr. C. had, "while retaining the *original title-page*, made many alterations in the version, and thousands of times departed from the three Doctors aforesaid." On these three arguments he rings the changes to satiety. By these he would demolish both my reputation for honesty and the character of the book. This is a short, but summary method. In reference to Mr. Landis and these assertions we shall again quote the words of Professor Stuart. In a letter to William E. Channing, D. D., 1830, he says, "*I do know that the accusations which you stand pledged to support are* NOT TRUE. *I aver that they* ARE NOT *before heaven and earth.* That they are accusations of a hurtful tendency need not be said. They go to destroy all respect for us—all confidence in us—all prospects of our usefulness to society or in the church, just so far as you are believed, and to render us the objects of suspicion, of scorn, and of hatred. As an injured man—as injured in a manner that is highly unjust and cruel, we call you (Messrs. Landis and Peters) either for reparation, or else to support your charges. *These charges are allegations as to matters of fact;* they are not matters of opinion merely, or the deductions which may be drawn from opinions. As *matters of fact* you are bound to support them. According to all demands of propriety and justice, you have no liberty to retreat by professing disdain of your opponent: you must either support them or take them back, or stand before the public

as those who have abused and maltreated their fellow-being—as a reviler and slanderer of your fellow-citizen."*

I say, gentlemen, with Professor Stuart, in a case by no means so palpably flagrant, cruel, and unjust, you must make amends in your American Biblical Repository, or depend upon it you must answer for it before another tribunal. You are not privileged to calumniate and abuse a large, respectable, and rapidly increasing community: nor maliciously to asperse and destroy my character to serve your purposes. You have no right to call me "a Unitarian," or to say that I am practising "a crime in no way differing from actual forgery" in my manner of publishing the New Version. You have blasphemed my character with all your readers; and you are in duty bound as publicly to take back the false charges you have printed, published, and sold to me† and against me. I will give you an opportunity of doing it, if you can honorably to yourselves. But gentlemen it must be done. You have both violated the law of Moses, the law of Christ, and also the laws of the States in which you reside; and it behoves you to repent immediately and do works meet for repentance, or perchance you may repent when it is too late.

A. C.

JOHN BUNYAN AND THE BISHOP.

John Bunyan, who, as most people know, was Pastor of the Baptist church at Bedford, was much in the habit of preaching in the surrounding villages; frequently walking, with a staff in his hand, many miles within a week for that purpose. In his itinerant excursions he was often met by the Bishop of Peterborough riding in his carriage. The Bishop's coachman, who was a Dissenter, and sometimes heard Bunyan, had made such representations of his wonderful talents as excited his lordship's curiosity. He consequently ordered the man, the next time he met Mr. Bunyan, to let him know.

The coachman in a short time met Mr. Bunyan on the high road; and, as he was desired, stopped the carriage, intimating that that was Mr. Bunyan, and to Mr. Bunyan that his lordship wished to speak to him. The Bishop, from his carriage window, then addressed the nonconformist:—"Mr. Bunyan, I understand you are very clever at interpreting difficult passages of scripture: what do you think is the meaning of St. Paul when he says to Timothy, 'The cloak that I left at Troas, with Carpus, when thou comest bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments'"? "Why, my lord," said Bunyan, "the passage is simple enough. Paul was a travelling preacher: Timothy was a primitive bishop. In those days it was customary for bishops to wait on travelling preachers. Paul, therefore, entrusts Timothy to look after his baggage, and to bring it with him when he comes. Times are altered since then. Now, bishops ride, and travelling preachers walk." The bishop threw himself back in his carriage, cried, "Humph," and ordered his coachman to drive on.

London Patriot

* Letters to W. E. Channing, D. D., page 37.

† I have been a paying subscriber to your work from the first number till now.

CHRISTIANS AMONG THE SECTS—*No. VIII.*

POSITIVE ORDINANCES.—SACRIFICES FOR SIN.

It has been said that the original penalty was inflicted the day of the transgression—that Adam died by substitution. It may be objected that this is a novel view of this matter, and an easy way of settling a controversy which has existed for ages. Be it so: it is the only way of understanding the denunciation as being fulfilled, and is in perfect unison with the whole remedial system—Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian. "The soul that sinneth it shall die," has been the motto, not a thousand years after the sin, but in the day of transgression; yet Adam lived nine hundred and thirty years (perhaps) after he sinned; and our divine Lord says, "He that believeth in me shall never die."

These things are all made to harmonize when we understand the scriptural doctrine of substitution." "And Abraham lifted up his eyes and looked, and behold, behind him a ram caught in a thicket by the horns; and Abraham went and took the ram and offered him up for a burnt offering *in the stead of his son*." Upon this subject I wish to be explicit, because the doctrine of vicarious suffering has been a stumbling block to many: but the difficulties have arisen wholly from the *absurdities* with which ignorance has invested the subject. When the doctrine is presented in its scriptural light even the *difficulties* of the philosophical Unitarian vanish, and the visions of Universalism fly like the dreams of a distempered imagination. A scriptural view of this doctrine prostrates in the dust the Calvinian system of unconditional election, the philosophy of Unitarianism, and the air-built fabric of Universalian benevolence: for, *mark it*, substitution alone can never touch the *guilt* of sin. Forgiveness *only* can remove the guilt of sin. Vicarious suffering prepares the way for the exercise of *forgiveness*, by bearing the punishment, and thus sustaining the dignity of the law. As has been formerly said, *guilt*, from its very nature, can never be transferred; but punishment may. But punishment can never take away guilt. An offender may bear the whole penalty of the law, (whether human or divine,) and yet feel all the weight of his guilt. The robber or the incendiary may toil in the Penitentiary until the demand of the law is satisfied; and, unless he gives evidence of penitence and reformation, so that community can feel to *forgive* him, he will come forth from prison the same despised guilty transgressor that he was when he entered the gloomy cell. Thus, when the transgressor under the former dispensations brought his victim to the altar, and laid his hands upon the head of the victim, confessing his sin, the punishment was indeed transferred; yet he would have gone away with all his guilt upon him, notwithstanding, had not *mercy followed* in the train of justice, and soothed the conscience by the heavenly accents, "And the *sin* which he hath sinned shall be *forgiven* him." How vain, then, is the hope of those who expect to be saved because Christ bore the *punishment* of our sins, while at the same time they live and die unforgiven!! How vain also is the hope of the man who trusts his whole salvation in the doctrine of "imputed *sin* and imputed righteousness"! Our Divine Lord never did, in the sense of this doctrine, bear *one sin* of the human race; and I exult in this truth: otherwise he would not have been such

a high priest as our guilty and wretched condition demanded. "For," says the Apostle, "such an High Priest became us, who is *holy*, *harmless*, *undefiled*, separate *from sinners*, and made higher than the heavens."

But to return to the sin-offerings of slain beasts: We wish to lay hold of the *spirit* and moral tendency of all the ordinances of divine appointment. I ask, can the human mind conceive an institution so calculated to humble the pride of man—to fill him with a sense of the malignity of sin, as the imposing ceremony of the sin-offering? The transgressor brings his victim, lays his hands upon its head, confesses his sin, is humbled under the conviction that he deserves to die in its stead: but rejoices in that love which has provided an innocent victim to suffer in his stead; and even now, at the period of three thousand years distance, my heart is filled with joyful sympathy for the pious Jew as he stood and saw the life's blood of the victim ebbing away, and his soul filled with love and gratitude as he heard from the oracles of truth the heavenly accents of mercy, "And the sin which he hath sinned shall be forgiven him."

We come next to consider the appointment of

A High Priest and Mediator.

The necessity of this appointment originated in the defilement and alienation of the soul, and the consequent *dread* of the divine purity and majesty. There are *moral*, as there are *physical* attractions. There are the *centripetal* and the *centrifugal* forces in the universe of mind, as well as in the universe of matter. The repulsive influence of sin on the mind, in impelling it away from God, is represented by the Prophet by the most striking similitude—"And our iniquities like the *wind* have driven us away." It was under the most painful sense of the moral distance between "the High and Holy One who inhabits eternity," and his erring creatures, that Job exclaimed, "Though I should wash myself with snow-water, and make my hands never so clean, yet shalt thou plunge me in the ditch and mine own clothes shall abhor me: for he is not a man, as I am, that we should come together in judgment: neither is there any *mesites* (mediator) betwixt us, that might lay his hand on us both." It was under the impulse of this feeling that the people of Israel exclaimed to Moses, "Speak thou with us, and we will hear; but let not God speak with us, lest we die." The effects produced upon the mind by the reaction of this appointment are, to keep alive that humility and self-abasement, and that sense of the divine purity and majesty which at first dictated the necessity of the appointment.

We will next consider

The Rest of the Sabbath Day.

"Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the order of them (established.) And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it he rested from all his work which God created and made." Gen. ii. 1, 2, 3. In condescension to our weakness the Divine Creator represents himself as wearied with the labor of six days, and, like man, rejoicing after his toil. He *sanctified* the day, or *set it apart* to himself. He made it *sacred* to rest from *earthly labors*, or from the work of creating the material universe. But when the Most

High gives this appointment to Israel his people, it is in these words: "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy; six days shalt thou labor and do all thy work; but the seventh is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." The primary object of this command was manifestly the sacred preservation of the first three—viz. the guarding the people from idolatry. The Lord gave *them* this day for their good—for their happiness. "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." On this day they were to cast off all worldly care and labor—not for the sake of the day itself, but for the moral impressions which the observance of the day was calculated to make on their minds—impressions which should remain with them during the bustle and toil of six ensuing days of labor. But when the design of this day, its worldly tendencies, was lost sight of—when the people in their blindness and apostacy thought they were giving to the Lord a portion of their time, to purchase the liberty of doing as they pleased the residue, then it was that their "Sabbaths were an abomination."

CHRISTIANOS.

THOUGHTS ON EVIDENCE—*No. I.*

BETHPHAGE, September 25th, 1839.

Brother Campbell,

IN taking a view of the Christian profession in this country, nothing seems to me more characteristic of those denominations usually styled *popular*, than a disposition to convert religion into something of so substantial and tangible a nature, that it shall be the object of sense rather than faith. The very religious phraseology of these denominations is an indication of their peculiar leanings in this respect; as, indeed, we might expect it to be, since words are but signs of thought, and the mouth only utters the dictates of the heart. Thus we find that such words as "sight," "feeling," "knowledge," "experience," constitute their *religious vocabulary*; and that the phrases "find religion," "get religion," "feel religion," "heart-religion," &c. enter largely into the composition of their *sacred style*. It is also perfectly consistent with these views of religion, that their public addresses should be directed to the feelings, and that the animal sensibilities of the human system should be in consequence so operated upon, as to produce those ejaculations, shoutings, swoonings, and convulsive paroxysms, which in harmony with the whole matter, are regarded as the direct, immediate, and sensible effects of a Divine Spirit.

It is, on the other hand, the leading trait of the reformation for which you have so successfully pleaded, to regard the Christian religion as a remedial system addressing itself in the *first* place to the REASON by its evidences, and *secondly* to the *heart*, *affections*, and *conduct* by its principles. In other words, it affirms that the gospel can only be received by *faith;* that this faith rests wholly upon the testimony of scripture addressed to the *understanding*, and that through the obedience of faith the penitent enjoys that pardon and those sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit which transform the character and issue in a life wholly devoted to God. Hence it is that we have such frequent occasion for the words "fact," "truth," "witness," "testimony," "faith;" and the phrases "word of God," "faith comes by hearing," "obey the gospel," &c. And if this be our form of speech, we have the satisfaction to know that it is also that of the scripture, a consideration in which we have reason to rejoice; for the more we employ the words of holy writ, the more we possess ourselves of the ideas they were designed to communicate; and it is no less true that whenever the current language of a religious community becomes a jargon of cant and unscriptural terms and expressions, their views of religion will be equally confused and incorrect.

The necessity of a return to the precise language and true sense of scripture has indeed been so forcibly urged within a few years, that the words of scripture are by no means so novel to the religious public as they were. Time was when to speak of the "Testimony of Matthew Levi," would have shocked the ears of orthodoxy, and created the blush of conscious ignorance upon even the plump cheeks of stall-fed theology. One was then reminded of Sir Pertinax MacSycophant when he claims of conscience were urged by his opponent. "Conscience," he exclaims with undisguised astonishment, "sir, it is an unparliamentary word"! As new in halls of divinity was formerly the word "testimony," and as worthy of being denounced as irreligious and untheological. But people have become accustomed to such language now; and custom, you know, is second nature: nor has the influence of your good example been without its effect, as some even of your enemies have acknowledged.

I cannot but think, after all, however, that those views of religion which make it to begin and end in feeling; in the emotions of the soul —the personal and actual sensations of the individual who is the subject of it, will continue to be popular. My reasons are: 1st. That men will always find it easier to bring religion down to their *animalism*, than to bring themselves up to its pure and lofty spirituality. 2dly. That a small minority only of those who reason, really think for

themselves. And, 3dly. That for one in whom reason predominates at all, we shall find ten who can only feel. I am reminded here of an anecdote of the celebrated Dr. Radcliffe, who, conversing one day with a noted quack called Case, inquired of him as they stood upon the steps of a public house in one of the crowded streets of London, how it happened that he should have so many patients and have amassed such a fortune, while he, Radcliffe, should continue comparatively poor. "How many persons," says Case, "do you think have passed by since we have been standing here?" "Twenty," says Radcliffe. "And how many of these," rejoins Case, "would you suppose to be wise men?" "Not more than two," replies the Doctor. "Very well," cries Case, "these will call upon you; the other eighteen will come to me."

But to enter a little more deeply into matters and approach more closely the subject upon which I wish to offer some reflections, I would here observe that we shall find the true origin of this disposition to make religion wholly the object of sense, in the desire (in some sense praiseworthy) of obtaining a stronger assurance of its *truth*. And this again springs from the false notion that the evidence of sense is superior to that of faith. For it is undeniable that there does universally exist the opinion that we can be incomparably more certain of that which is presented to our senses, than we can be of things unseen, by what testimony soever their existence may be attempted to be proved.

It matters not how we may account for this opinion; whether it have originated in the circumstance that there are few who walk by faith—few actions which proceed from faith—in short, that there is but little faith in the land; and that men seeing so little of the effects of this principle, and on the other hand so much of the influence of sense, have come to regard faith as almost inert and altogether inferior in power; or that the leaders of the people have presented such incorrect views of the subject as to have given this unfortunate bias to their minds; its universal prevalence and influence are too evident. I am unaware that much is said by the popular religious teachers about the power of faith; but while they employ the word, they signify by it a conviction which resulted, not from hearing the word of God, but from certain overwhelming evidence impressed upon the internal or external senses—such as miraculous visions, special revelations, &c.; so that it is manifest the attempt to conceal under the term "faith" a conviction, which, in all honesty and candor, they should call knowledge.—So that, upon the whole, nothing can be plainer than that true religious faith, the result of written testimony, is almost wholly repudiated by the religious public; that this faith, and every thing else in religion,

with the exception of the "experience" above alluded to, is reduced to the level of mere opinion; and that the evidence of sense is considered incalculably superior to every other species of evidence.

Now there can be no sentiments more false than these, and none more fatal in their tendencies. It is high time that these matters were examined to the bottom, and that the whole subject of evidence were explored, and so presented to the community that the mists of ignorance and mysticism would be dispelled. I have long wished to see this taken up in a systematic manner by one so competent as yourself You have indeed, confuted the popular views of faith, and have fully shown the natural and necessary connexion between facts, testimony, faith, and feeling, together with many other important and interesting points; but I would wish to see the whole subject of evidence considered in all its branches, and these deep-rooted errors above spoken of if possible eradicated. I have heard you, I think, promise to expose the common error that the authority of a great man may be lawfully used as evidence on both sides of a controversy. This would naturally come into view in its proper place in weighing the value of evidence, should you be pleased to take a more enlarged circuit. In the mean time I beg leave to offer in your next number a few thoughts upon the matter which I have introduced. R. R.

"OUR NAME."

BROTHER CAMPBELL,

Dear Sir—I ADMIRE the prudent close of the article above alluded to in your last Harbinger. Having quit where you did, and as you did, you have given, in the first place, to this reformation a month's time for reflection and consideration; and, in the next place, have narrowed and simplified the subject matter for reflection to a mere point.

We all know that names are matters of great importance. In selecting ours we should do it with all imaginable prudence and caution. I have reflected a little upon the subject, and will give you the name which I prefer myself, with some of my reasons; not pretending, however, to presume that it is the most appropriate, but merely suggest it for your consideration, knowing that you have the ability to investigate its claims thoroughly.

In the first place, then, anciently when the followers of Christ were admitted into his kingdom by faith, repentance, and immersion, they were called "disciples." This may be said to have been their primitive name; or, if you please, their surname. By the word "*disciple*" is meant a learner, student, or scholar. Hence Christ says, "Learn of me," &c. And so we see in primitive times the heathens had their "disciples, as of Plato, &c; and in modern times Methodist disciples, Presbyterian disciples, &c.—learning of Methodism, &c. And in the

days of the Apostles, and at the early period when the Man of Sin began his unhallowed work, and impostors of various kinds sprang up and led away disciples after them, it became necessary that the disciples of Christ should be further designated to distinguish them from the disciples of the heathen philosophers, as well as from being confounded with the various sectarian disciples of that day. The same necessity still exists. To effect this object they were called *Christians* at Antioch. We have no account that after they were called Christians they surrendered or threw away the name of Disciples; but continued ever after to be known by both names; or, perhaps, by both names united, as forming but one name; as, *Christian Disciples*, meaning the disciples of Christ: thus giving to these disciples what we now call a Christian name. This I think highly probable, and therefore should prefer to be known and called a *Christian Disciple* in preference to being called either the one or the other alone, for the following reasons:—

1st. The term "disciple," when there are so many kinds in the world, would be much too general, unless we add some term to it to signify whose, or what sort of disciples we are, would leave it still doubtful whether we are the disciples of Christ or Mahomet. But when it is said we are *Christian* Disciples, it negatives at once the idea of our being any other than the disciples of Christ.

2d. I object also to being called "*Christian*" alone, for one of the reasons above assigned—it is too general. We hear of Presbyterian Christians, Quaker Christians, &c.; and besides, Unitarians have adopted it, and became a sect under it; and if we adopt it we shall instantly be called *Unitarians;* besides they will claim us, and the world will give us to them "in spite of our teeth," as the saying is.

WM. R. COLE.

Wilmington, Ia., August 25, 1839.

REMARKS.

Our brother Cole adds another reason, which is private and local, and not general.

These reasons are equally good whether applied to "*Christian Disciples*" or "*Disciples of Christ*," and so is his third reason. But, as before observed, both *Christian* and *Disciple* are *common*, not proper names—neither of them is a patronymic. But it will be said probably in reply to my last notice on this subject, that "*Christ*" became a proper name by the mere force of usage; and that instead of "*Jesus the Christ*," custom, in less than forty years, made it "*Jesus Christ.*"—Very good: It is just as true of the word "*disciple*" That in the time of Luke was a *proper name;* and, without any epithet whatever, distinguished the disciples of Christ as much as any patronymic could have done. Read the Acts of the Apostles, and observe that, while once they are called "the disciples of the Lord," they are often called *disciples;* as in Acts xx. 7.—as a fixed, proper, and definite name—approved by all the Apostles, and used by authority.

I agree with brother Cole that "*Christian Disciples*" is a very appro-

priate name; so is "*the Disciples of the Lord*," or of *Christ*, and, for convenience, propriety, and authority, the term DISCIPLES alone is sufficiently graphic, definite, and authoritative. So is the epithet "*the brethren*." I am not, however, pertinacious. The brethren all have a vote in this matter; and among the candidates for public favor, I give my vote for "*the Disciples*," or for the "Disciples of Christ." This is, for the reasons now given, my choice: but I will not contend with any man for a mere name, especially when they are all good. I believe since the age of *christening* that folks are usually passive in receiving a name. A. C.

ORDINATION—*NO. I.*

Brother Crihfield:

In Vol. 3, No. 2 of the Heretic Detector, I find several essays from the pen of our excellent Brother Winans on the subject of Ordination, addressed to '*Professor Shannon*.'

I am, no doubt, the person intended, the *official designation* merely being erroneous. My worthy Brother says he writes 'for the purpose of inducing me to write.' I know not, that I can throw any light on this subject, which has already been discussed by so many able tongues and pens, and which, to some minds, still seems to (*lis sub judice*) an unsettled point. I am perfectly willing, however, to contribute my mite, for the purpose of ascertaining what the Christian Scriptures teach on this subject. For the sake of brevity and distinctness, permit me to arrange my remarks in reply to the call of Brother Winans under the following heads:

1st. *Is ordination by the imposition of hands* necessary to authorize a *disciple of Christ* to preach the Gospel, and baptize believers?

2d. What is the Scriptural meaning of Ordination?

3d. What does the New Testament teach about the laying on of hands?

If ordination by the laying on of hands is necessary to authorize a disciple of Christ to proclaim the Gospel, and baptize believers, then, indeed, we may fairly expect to find this doctrine taught in the New Testament with great plainness. For, beyond doubt, the whole success of the Gospel depends on its being proclaimed. Without having heard the Gospel, no human being ever believed it, or was converted by it.

Now, if it has been enacted by Zion's King, that these disciples alone should preach the Gospel, who have been set apart to the work by the imposition of hands—then, to say the very least, it would be *blameworthy* for any Christian to attempt '*to minister* in holy things,' (I use the language of Babylon, in order to be understood,) who had not been thus *consecrated* to the work. Hence, it is apparent, that the salvation of men by the Gospel, is made absolutely to depend on the plainness with which this doctrine, if it be Scriptural, is taught in the Living Oracles. Let us, then, examine for a little, how this matter stands.

In the first place, I have never been able to find *a single passage* in the New Testament, which *gave the least countenance to the notion*, that disciples of Christ, as such, have not the right to preach the Gospel, and baptize believers—but that this right is confined to such, as have been *consecrated by the laying on of hands*. Such a passage I sought for, while I was an *orthodox* Baptist, with as much diligence, as I sought for a passage in support of infant sprinkling, while I was an *orthodox* Presbyterian. My searching, however, was utterly vain. Nay, more, I have never been able to find an individual, even among the sects, who will pretend to say, that he knows any passage in the New Testament, which directly teaches that doctrine. In December, 1829, according to previous appointment, I spent a day in the investigation of this subject, accompanied with fasting and prayer, at the house of one of the most talented and excellent Baptist Preachers in the Southern Atlantic States. Several worthy and intelligent Baptist Preachers took part in the conference. When I asked for a passage in the New Testament, teaching the doctrine, that none of the disciples, except the *specially Called and Sent*, should preach and baptize—Hebrews v. 4, was produced. "No man taketh this *honor* unto himself, but he that is *called of God*, as was Aaron."

A very brief examination of the passage in its connexion convinced the company, that it spoke exclusively of the office of High Priest, and had no more to do with the business of preaching, than it had with that of planting corn, or making horse-shoes.

When I called for another passage, it was acknowledged by the venerable Patriarch, and by all the company, that there was no text in the New Testament, which taught the doctrine *directly*—but they *inferred it* from certain passages, such as the diversities of gifts, spoken of by Paul in the 12th chapter of 1st Corinthians. It was even denied on this occasion, that *licensing and ordaining gave any power*, or was to be regarded as any thing more, than a *recognition* of the power previously derived from a higher source. I showed, that this plea was *suicidal*, and in direct opposition to the meaning of the term *license*, and the generally received import of the transaction. It is obvious, that if *licensing and ordination* do not give any authority to preach the Gospel and baptize, an individual has no power for that specific purpose after ordination, which he had not before.

Inasmuch, then, as by the commandment of the Everlasting God, the Gospel was to be proclaimed unto all nations for the *obedience* of faith, and the command was given, not to the enemies of our Lord, but to his disciples, if it be restricted to a *particular class* of disciples, it never can be obeyed, unless it be made perfectly plain in the New Testament, who constitute that privileged order, whose right it is *exclusively*, 'to minister in holy things.'

This view of the subject most evidently to my apprehension throws the burden of proof on those, who would restrict the business of preaching and baptizing to the '*Called* and *Sent*,'—the '*Ordained*,'—the '*Priesthood*'—a particular order in the church, to whom it pertains *exclusively*, in Babylonish phrase, '*to minister in the sacred desk*.'

But, though we might with great propriety, rest the matter here, until the advocates of *restriction* in this business bring some *direct* Scripture proof of its existence, which we have never yet known to be done—still,

for the sake of the *prejudiced*, we choose to pursue a different course. And, as it is impossible to prove a negative *directly*, we shall in the present essay content ourselves with examining, whether these, who are mentioned in the New Testament as being engaged in proclaiming the Gospel, were authorized for, and set apart to the work by the imposition of hands.

In strictness we need go no farther back than to the day of Pentecost, on which the reign of Heaven began. We choose, however, to go to—'the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.' 'John did baptize in the wilderness and preach the baptism of repentance *for the remission of sins*.' Mark i. 1—4.

It has never been hinted, so far as is known to me, that John was consecrated to this work by the hands of a presbytery.

But, how was it with those whom the Saviour sent to preach while he was on earth? In John xv. 16, we find him saying to the twelve, 'Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and *ordained* you,' &c. Now in what way were they ordained? Luke vi. 13, informs us. 'And when it was day, he called unto him his disciples, and of them he chose twelve, whom also he named Apostles.' No intimation whatever is made about the laying on of hands. Luke ix. 1, records the ordination of the twelve, and 1st verse of the next chapter records that of the seventy to a missionary tour. How was it done? Simply, he *appointed* and *sent* them.

As yet, then, we find no trace of the laying on of hands, to qualify or authorize men to announce the good news of the approaching Reign. Let us come now to the Commission.

From the record made of it, both by Matthew and Mark, it seems to have been given to the eleven; but in what capacity, whether as Apostles, or simply as disciples, we are not informed. If it was given to them simply as disciples, then is it binding on *all disciples*, in proportion to their several abilities. But, if it was given to the eleven, as Apostles merely, then is it binding on none but Apostles. Consequently, when Apostles ceased on earth, the obligation of the Commission ceased also. And, therefore, all the exertions, that have been made since that time, to carry the Commission into effect, have been unauthorized by Heaven, and in contravention of the will of God. Hence, on this hypothesis, in order to make it the duty of any part of the disciples to preach, it would be necessary to prove that part to be Apostles. Nor, even then, would it follow, that they should be *ordained by the laying on of hands, nor ordained by men* in any form. For it is very evident that the *simple choice* by Christ of twelve from among his disciples to be Apostles constituted the *only ordination* made by the Saviour to that office, so far as we have any record in the New Testament. The appointment of Matthias is admitted on all hands, I believe, to be one (*sui generis*) of a special character, and furnishing no example for imitation. At any rate, it gives no countenance to the doctrine of *ordination by the laying on of hands*. Perhaps that may be the reason why the advocates of this doctrine find so little use for it.

We have already showed, that if the Commission were given to the eleven, as Apostles merely, it would be in contravention of the will of God for any except Apostles to preach and baptize. But, others did preach with the sanction of the Apostles, and the manifest approba-

of Heaven. This proves that the Commission was given to the eleven simply as disciples; otherwise the mass of the primitive disciples would not have dared to act under it; nor would the Apostles sanctioned, nor Heaven approbated such action. Let us examine a few of those cases, and see if they will throw any light on this subject.

In the 7th and 8th Acts, we are informed of the preaching of Stephen and Philip. The 6th of Acts gives us an account of their *ordination by the laying on of Apostles' hands.* To what work, however, were they thus ordained? Was it to *'the ministry of the word?'* So far from it, that it was to a work, which was placed by the Apostles themselves, on that very occasion, in *contradistinction* with this ministry. It was to serve tables. When they preached, therefore, it was simply as disciples, and not in consequence of any ordination required in the New Testament. Yet, though they *were never ordained* to *'the ministry of the word,'* Stephen was the first to suffer martyrdom in preaching the Gospel; and Philip, as is well known, not merely preached, but also baptized the Ethiopian Eunuch, and many of the Samaritans.

In Acts viii. 1—4, we are informed that after the martyrdom of Stephen, 'there was a great persecution against the Church, which was at Jerusalem: and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria, *except the Apostles.*' We are furthermore informed that 'they that were scattered abroad went every where *proclaiming the word.*'

Can any thing be plainer, or more decisive than this? Who preached on this occasion? Luke answers—'They that were scattered abroad,' And if we ask him again, 'Who were these?' he replies—'All the church in Jerusalem, *except the Apostles.*' The man who can make this passage tally with a dogma, that none should preach and baptize, except such as have been ordained by the laying on of hands, whether official or *unofficial.* need afterwards find but little difficulty in believing that JONAH SWALLOWED THE WHALE—and found his belief, too, on the testimony of the historian, that the *Whale swallowed Jonah.*

Of the ordination of Ananias, who baptized Saul, we have not the slightest hint. He is barely mentioned (Acts ix. 10,) as 'a certain disciple.' Of Saul himself we are informed, that straightway after his baptism, 'he preached Christ in the Synagogues, that he is the Son of God.'

Some, however, are of the opinion, that the record contained in Acts xiii. 1—3, conflicts with the foregoing views. This cannot be the case for a very plain reason. Paul assures us most positively in the first chapter of Galatians, that when he was converted 'he conferred not with flesh and blood,' in relation to preaching the Gospel, but immediately set about it. This, too, is in perfect harmony with the record of his conversion given us in Acts. 'Straightway he preached Christ.' Whatever, therefore, may have been the design of the transaction in question, it could not have been intended, as giving authority to preach and baptize.

But could it even be demonstrated, that this transaction was an *ordination to the ministry*, in the modern sense of the phrase, it would not, and *could not* form a model for our imitation.

Hear the reason. The Church at Antioch, as a Church, had nothing

to do with the transaction, so far as the record gives us any information. It was the act, not of the body, but of inspired men—'certain *prophets* and *teachers*'—appertaining to the body. Should any have the least doubt, as to their being *inspired*, he may remove that doubt by barely glancing at 1st Cor. xii. 28.

Besides, these inspired men did not act in the case, in obedience to any general rule, but rather in obedience to the *special command* of the Holy Spirit. 'As they ministered unto the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost, said Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work, whereunto I have called them.'

It is universally admitted by the candid and intelligent of all parties, that *special commands* are to be *obeyed only by those* to whom they are given;—and not even by them, except at the *time when*, and in *the manner in which* they are delivered. The foregoing command was manifestly *special*, both as regards the *persons addressed*, and the thing to be done; and, therefore, it never was obligatory on a human being except the Prophets and Teachers in the Church at Antioch—nor on them, except in that solitary instance.

It is a great and mischievous error, a strong pillar in the temple of *sectarian idolatry and superstition*, to give a *general application* to *special* commands, and interpret special Scriptures in a general way.

If the foregoing case must be made an example, why not make the ordination of Matthias an example for our imitation? It has by no means so much appearance of *speciality*, as the transaction in question. And I can see no reason, why it, as well as Acts xiii, 1—3, is not referred to by the sects, as an authoritative example for the *ordination* of Preachers, but that it does not suit their notions, nor support the *laying on of hands*. If it were the order of the day to manufacture '*Clergymen*' out of disciples by the *casting of lots*, no doubt the ordination of Matthias would be appealed to with as much confidence, as that with which the foregoing passage is quoted under existing circumstances. Nor can I discover, that there would be *less reason* in one case, than in the other.

Let us come next to the case of Timothy, recorded Acts xvi. 1—3. 'Him would Paul have to go forth with him; and took and circumcised him, because of the Jews, which were in those quarters: for they all knew that his father was a Greek.'

Not another word is said about *this ordination*, either here, or in any other part of the New Testament. I am well aware that some good people think differently. They think, that Paul in 1 Tim. iv. 14, distinctly recognizes his ordination as a '*Clergyman*,'—and that, too, by the imposition of hands. Let us examine this matter. 'Neglect not (says Paul in the passage alluded to) the *gift* that is *in thee*, which was given thee bp prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery.' Who composed this Presbytery will come up for examination in our essay on imposition of hands. It is sufficient to notice here, that *this* Presbytery *could*, because *it did* impart a spiritual gift, and that Paul says not one word about *an office* to which Timothy was *ordained* —but speaks solely of *a gift*, that had been imparted to, or put *in* him by (or *according* to) prophecy with (or *through*) the laying on of hands. Nothing short of the grossest *assumption* can make this passage teach either the *fact*, or the *manner* of Timothy's ordination to any office

whatever. If when the Apostle tells Timothy that a *gift* was *in him*, he meant, that *Timothy* was *in an office*, and I am allowed to interpret Scripture in this way, I will prove to a demonstration, that the Pope of Rome is the Vicar and legal representative of Jesus Christ. Is it not by this same unhallowed license of *accommodation*, (I will not say interpretation, for it deserves not the name,) that to 'be born of water and of the Spirit,' is rendered so as to exclude *water* altogether—and 'Repent and be baptized *for* the remission of your sins'—is translated, 'Repent, &c. *because* your sins *are* remitted!'

It is certainly unnecessary to follow this subject farther. There is, in short, *not a single passage* in the New Testament, which records the fact, that any disciple ever had hands laid on him to authorize him to preach the gospel and baptize believers. If there is any such passage, I shall feel greatly indebted to the person who will point it out.

We have already proved, that if *no such limitation* of the Commission is expressly taught, no such limitation could have been intended. Indeed, to proclaim the good news for the salvation of sinners, is so manifestly *a moral duty*, as to need no positive statute to make it obligatory on all the disciples. On the contrary, it would require a *positive statute to exempt* any disciple from an obligation in this matter proportional to his abilities.

For the present, I shall only add, in accordance with this sentiment, the heavenly words of our exalted King, as John in the island of Patmos heard them from his own blessed lips, 'I am the *root* and the *offspring* of David, and the bright and morning star. And the spirit, &c. And *let him that heareth say, come.* And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.'

Ought we, then, to regard the statute of the King—'*Let him that heareth say*, COME'—or rather give heed to the voice of the *Clergy* crying, Stop! Don't say, come, till WE have permitted and authorized you, by the laying on of OUR HANDS. Let every *loyal citizen* judge for himself, which of these *opposite* commands ought to be obeyed.

In loyalty to the King, love to his liege subjects, and devotion to the truth, I remain your fellow-citizen,

JAMES SHANNON.

P. S. Will Brother Campbell oblige me by republishing these essays in the Harbinger, and pointing out wherein, if at all, they do not accord with the unerring standard. J. S.

I shall reserve any remarks on this very explicit and sententious article, till our readers have Brother Shannon's No. 2 before them.

A. C.

OUR NAME.

From the Christian Herald.

"*The Child Named.*—In the September number of the Millennial Harbinger Mr. Campbell has given the final name to this new sect, and has argued the propriety of his name at length. In this article he has drawn his denominational lines, set up his landmarks, and christened his sect. Disciples of Christ is their name.

The article is headed, OUR NAME, and shows pretty clearly that Mr. Campbell would prefer the name *Christian* to all others, if that name was not already "appropriated." He says, "We have been anticipated. The term *Christian* in New England, and some other sections of this land, is a name chosen and appropriated by a party who boast they are *Unitarians*—disbelieve in baptism for the remission of sins—and refuse to celebrate the Lord's death as often as they celebrate his resurrection."

This draws the line, then, and shows that Mr. Campbell's sect are *Trinitarians*—baptize for the remission of sins, and celebrate the Lord's death by partaking of the supper every Sabbath; while the Christians are not Trinitarians, but "believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God"—do not baptize for the remission of sins, but believe that "all who believe shall receive remission of sins," which makes them proper subjects of baptism; "If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest"—do not partake of the Lord's supper every Sabbath, but in accordance with the direction, "This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me."

In the progress of this new sect there has been an obvious desire to appear one with Christians in some places, but the article under consideration draws a marked line between the two, both in name, sentiment, and practice.

As no people are pleased with a nick-name, we think it would be well hereafter, in speaking of that people, to use the name they have now publicly appropriated to themselves.

Mr. Campbell uses four arguments in favor of taking the distinctive name *Disciple* at this time, in preference to *Christian*. 1. They were called Disciples before they were called Christians. 2. It is more descriptive. 3. It is used in the New Testament oftener than Christian. 4. It is unappropriated—it is the name of no other sect. This, he says, is better still. That is, it is better for being the name of no other sect, than for being ancient, descriptive, and scriptural! Wonderful!! Some have been disposed to think that very little difference existed between the *Disciples* and *Christians;* and that they might, and ultimately would, become one people; but it is hoped that by this time, all will see that such a visionary scheme is given to the winds."

REMARKS.

This shows that we have not mistaken our New England friends, called "Christians." They admit those three distinctive characteristics of the party, and thereby prove that those first called Christians at Antioch and themselves are two very different sorts of people. Peter baptized for the remission of sins. "The disciples came together" not upon *a* first day of the week, when they could make it convenient, but "upon *the* first day of the week to break the loaf; and we never find the term *Unitarian* in the New Testament.

Our kind friend of the *Christian Herald* does not reason quite so logically when he supposes we call ourselves *Trinitarians* because he glories in the name *Unitarian.* This is a genuine *non sequitur.* If a man say he is not a *Unitarian*, does it follow that he is a *Quintarian*,

a *Sextarian*, or a *Trinitarian*? For my part, I cordially repudiate *Unitarian*, *Trinitarian*, *Quintarian*, *Sextarian*, &c. I think them all any thing but Christian names. We choose the name *Disciples of Christ* for the four reasons he assigns, and rejoice that we were so fortunate to find the oldest and most descriptive, and most scriptural of all names yet unappropriated. We have not one word in the New Testament indicative that ever the Apostles called their party Christians, or that they ever accepted of the name; while it is incontrovertible that they delighted in the name *Disciples*.

I am sorry to hear the "Christian Herald" say that he hopes that the Disciples and the Christians will not ultimately become one——"that this visionary scheme is given to the winds."—Does he love his Unitarian and his human traditions better than the whole New Testament, and the union and co-operation of all the true followers and scholars of Jesus Christ?

Will he please be as courteous to these remarks as I have been to his, in laying them before my readers? Among the Christians of New England I doubt not there are many disciples of Christ, who, if they knew our views as well as we know theirs, would form a better opinion of us than our friend of the Herald. A. C.

A PAIDOBAPTIST GENERAL LAW REPEALED.

A friend handed me the other day a pamphlet written by Rev. J. T. Hendricks, pastor of the Presbyterian church at Millersburg and Stoner-Mouth, Kentucky, 1838; and pointed me to the following page, containing a New General Rule or Law recently enacted by the said Mr. Hendricks, in aid of the suffering, languishing, dying cause of Infant affusion in the words following, to wit:

"We may here remark with regard to these prepositions, that it is a general rule, when *eis* is used to express the idea of entering *into* a place, it is twice mentioned, but when it signifies simply *to* a place, or *at* a place, it is used but *once*. See Luke xviii. 17. "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, shall in nowise, (eiseltha eis autan) enter therein." Here the preposition *eis* is *repeated*, and the rule says it means the same in composition as in other places. Again. Matthew vi. 6, Christ, speaking of prayer, says, "enter into (eiselthe eis) thy closet." Matthew vii. 21, Christ says, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, (eiseleusetai eis) shall enter into the kingdom of heaven." Also: Matthew xii. 4, he says of David, "he entered into (eisalthen eis) the house of God." See also, Matthew xxv. 21, and xxvii. 53; Mark i. 21: xlv. 2: i. 5—13: ix. 25: x. 15: xv. 11: xvi. 5: Luke i. 9: viii. 30—33: ix. 34: x. 38. We

might cite a page of such instances, where the preposition is invariably *doubled* to express the idea of entering *into* a place, but if simple motion *to* a place is intended, it is *not doubled*, but stands alone. Thus in the case of Philip and the Eunuch, if they had entered *into* the water, the preposition *eis* would have been repeated in composition with the verb as well as before the noun *water;* but it is not so in the original—*eis* is used but *once*—they went down from the chariot *to* the water. Let this rule be remembered and the case will be plain to every candid mind. Our opponents consider this case of Philip and the Eunuch as the strongest in the Bible to prove immersion; but we are willing to stake the whole controversy, as to the *mode*, on this passage. We claim it as proving, from all the circumstances, most unequivocally *our mode* of baptism."

The law is that *eis*, whose primary meaning is *into*, only means *into* when twice repeated; when once repeated it means *to*. Thus when we find *eis* prefixed to a verb and affixed to it, it means *into*. Whether this law was passed by Mr. Hendricks alone, or by some other with him, I know not; but certain I am, it was unknown to all the New Testament writers, and to all Greek critics before the year 1838. But this is an extraordinary age—an age of mind, of original ideas, of new discoveries—and knowledge is increasing.

I have, however, some scrupulosity in admitting the constitutionality of the new general law. First, because its author has given us but *one example* of it repeated 19 times!—Don't laugh, polite reader, at the gravity of the Rev. Mr. Hendricks, in illustrating a general law by one example repeated 19 times. He might have done it 207 times. I mean the verb *eiserchomai*, translated *enter*, occurs some 207 times in the New Testament. Of these two hundred and seven times, he has given us but nineteen. And as Solomon said, when seeking for a virtuous woman, he counted "one by one;" I examined these "one by one," and actually found as reported, that he sustains his general law by one and the same verb, in each and every case of the aforesaid nineteen! So that in truth he proves a general law by one single example. To expose the folly of this new general rule, I shall pass a similar law, saying that *in* never signifies *within*, unless it be found once in the verb and once after it, and then affirm that *en* in the verb *enter*, is the same as if it were spelled *inter*. I then quote from the New Testament nineteen passages, in every one of which the word *enter* is found. Such as, "*enter* in the house"—"*enter* in at the straight gate"—"*enter* in the city," &c., and then say, behold in all these cases *in* means *within* or *into*, because twice occurring. Then to give it authority, I say, mark, reader, I have given you *nineteen* examples, and could give many more of the truth of my general law. Might not any man acquainted with English say, Sir, you impose either upon us or upon

yourself, or upon both. It is but one example—it is the same word *enter* in all the given examples. Now, candid reader, this is precisely the case in Mr. Hendricks' law. It is the word *enter* in every case.

2. But in the 2d place, the word *enter* or *eiserchomai* is never found used in reference to baptism in all the New Testament; and, therefore, the rule of this verb reaches not the case in one single instance!

3. In the 3d place we have *eis* four times in the narrative concerning the Eunuch, besides its connexion with the water; in each of which it cannot mean less than *into*, though translated *to*. 1. "The way that leadeth from Jerusalem to, *into* Gaza." 2. "He had gone up to, *into* Jerusalem to worship." 3. "Philip was found in, *within* Azotus." 4. "And he went to, *into* Samaria." Now as in these four cases *eis* cannot signify less than *into*—in the name of reason why should it not also signify *into* when prefixed to *water!* In no one of these four cases have we *eis* repeated. It is always single and alone. Why then should it mean in the one case, he went *into* Cesarea—*into* Jerusalem, and in the other, he was baptized or immersed *at* the water!!

4. If this be not enough to cover the new law and the law-maker with the greatest confusion, I shall specify a few cases still more glaring:—

We have the phrase "*into* the sea," some ten or twelve times in the New Testament;—in the original we have *eis* as often before sea. Never twice—*only once in every case.* Now according to this new law it should be—The swine rushed down to the sea, and were drowned at or near the water, but not in it. The demons, too, did not go *into* the swine, but only went near to them. "They cast their net not into the sea, but near to it, and caught fish upon the dry land." You shall say to this mountain or this tree, be cast not *into the sea*, but near to the sea, &c. &c. If this emetic will not cleanse the stomach of the Rev. Mr. Hendricks, we can give him a few more portions of *Lobelia Inflata.*

We have the phrase "*into heaven*" often in the New Testament. I find it nine times with a single *eis* before it, for once it is repeated. Now, shall we say that it only meant *to* and not *into*, as Mr. Hendricks has enacted. Jesus did not ascend *into*, but only near to heaven. He was received not *into*, but near to heaven, &c. &c. The same is true of the phrases "*into hell—into eternal life.*"

By this time I presume our readers, even the Rev. Mr. Hendricks himself, will say it is enough. We can find a hundred instances for his one. Indeed I do not know of more than two or three instances which he can find in the whole book. There is not a particle of truth in this new law. It is as bare faced a fraud as was ever palmed on any

community. Surely he would not knowingly thus trifle with the law of Christ, the words of eternal life!

The papal rite of infant sprinkling has caused more perversion of scripture, reason and criticism; it has occasioned more sin, more presumption, more prevarication, more remorse than any other human tradition in this country. It is a manifold evil, injurious to society, both religious and political, and ought to be thoroughly exposed by all intelligent and virtuous men.

I only read two or three pages in the aforesaid tract of Mr. Hendricks. Perhaps I may find leisure for a page or two more; I may then notice it farther. Meanwhile, I would advise this pastor to legislate no more for the Greeks until he is better acquainted with their language, and especially with so much of it as is found in the New Testament.

A. C.

MR. MEREDITH AND THE BIBLICAL RECORDER.

I saw the other day, in a "Biblical Recorder," which had till then escaped my notice, that its Editor declared his willingness and readiness to discuss with me the subject of Spiritual Influence, or to sustain the Baptist views of *regeneration by the Spirit alone.* I cannot now lay my hand upon the said paper, but believe that I have given the substance. I would respectfully inform Mr. Meredith that he will find at the close of my essays on Mr. Lynd's various attempts to sustain that dogma, a proposition to stereotype or publish a volume of moderate size, and sell at cost, in co-partnery with him, each furnishing an alternate letter, of say four octavo pages, to be first published in our respective papers, and that this shall be an end of the matter—this volume being universally circulated amongst the Baptists and the Disciples throughout the length and breadth of this land. I hereby inform Mr. Meredith that I have no objection to accept of him in lieu of Mr. Lynd, who has retired from the conflict; provided only, he will be more courteous and Christian-like in his style, than in his former communications; so that he will not offend the good taste of any Christian into whose hands the work may fall. I promise to show, in that style, that the Regular Baptist Confession of Faith views of this subject are *unscriptural and of injurious tendency to society.* I wish to have this matter finally and satisfactorily set forth, that every man who chooses may hear both sides, and decide for himself.

A. C.

CHRISTIANS AMONG THE SECTS.

JAMESTOWN, Ohio, 15th October, 1839.

Dear brother Campbell,

I HAVE not read with sufficient attention the essays of *Christianos*, to enable me to point out the errors, nor to appreciate the truths contained in them. But one thing stands out prominent in these essays, and that thing is, that a man may be right in heart, and wrong in head; or, in other words, that a man may be right in practice, and wrong in theory. That a man may know the theory of a thing without reducing it to practice, every body knows: but how a man can practise upon a theory without a knowledge of it, is not so easily understood. Every body knows that a servant may know his master's will and not do it; but nobody ever thought of his doing the will of his master without knowing it. It does seem to me that heart-religion, abstract from head-religion, would be a religion of ignorance; and many there be who advocate just such a religion, and try to save the world by *ignorance*. Of all the gods that have ever been worshipped, or of all saviours ever preached to mankind, none stand as low in my estimation as does the god and saviour *Ignorance*. I must confess that I would rather worship an "unknown God" ignorantly, than to depend on ignorance as my saviour.

But I have never read after one of these writers whose theme was "*heart religion*," but that he cut his own throat before he was done spinning; and just so *Christianos* will do when he comes to speak of positive institutions: for the theory is not worth a fig if knowledge has to precede action, because that would change it into head-religion carried out into practice. To talk or write about "Christians," who do not know what it requires to make a man a Christian, is like talking or writing about chickens without eggs, or butter without milk. If there be any such *ignorant Christians*, they are among other Christians like mushrooms among vegetables, or soaked horse-hairs among snakes.

But as T. M. Henley is already down upon "Christianos," and as you have threatened him, I will not push at him at all, unless you include with him all those foolish talkers and writers, who preach and write about "*heart-religion*" without "*head-religion*." If you include them all, then you may set me down as one against them.

M. WINANS.

A review of Christianos is in contemplation as soon as he gets to port. He seems to be keeping off the coast just now. His prow, I trow, will ere long incline to the shore. A. C.

TWO WITNESSES FOR IMMERSION.

WE have noticed in several of our exchange papers the following extract from the second volume of Dr. Chalmers' Lectures on Romans, just published. In penning these remarks Dr. Chalmers has but followed the great body of learned Divines, who, notwithstanding their

prejudices, have been compelled to bear testimony to the right way, though they walk not therein:—

"The original meaning of the word *baptism* is *immersion;* and though we regard it as a point of indifference whether the ordinance so named be performed in this way or by sprinkling, yet we doubt not that the prevalent style of the administration, in the Apostle's days, was by an actual submerging of the whole body under water. We advert to this for the purpose of throwing light on the analogy that is instituted in these verses. Jesus Christ, by death, underwent this sort of baptism, even an immersion under the surface of the ground, whence he soon emerged again by his resurrection. We, by being baptized into his death, are conceived to have made a similar institution. In the act of descending under the water of baptism to have resigned an old life, and in the act of ascending to emerge into a new life—along the course of which it is our part to maintain a strenuous avoidance of that sin which as good as expunged the being we had formerly; and a strenuous prosecution of that holiness which should begin the first moment that we were ushered into our present being, and be perpetuated, and make progress toward the perfection of full and ripened immortality."

Baptist Register.

And also the following:—

"Boswell, in his "Life of Johnson," relates that that distinguished philosopher and moralist, in arguing one day on some particular tenets of the Church of Rome, said in defence of their practice of giving the bread only to the laity in the sacrament: "They may think that in what is merely ritual, deviations from the primitive mode may be admitted on the ground of convenience; and *I think they are as well warranted to make this alteration as we are to substitute sprinkling in the room of the ancient baptism.*" This admission, made apparently with perfect simplicity and sincerity, yielding the point that sprinkling is a substitute in the room of ancient baptism, is entitled to some consideration, if we consider the source from whence it came, and the circumstances of the question. The whole matter, it is well known, turns on the interpretation to be given to a single Greek verb. On this subject, then, this "giant of literature," who could converse in Greek, who amused himself during his sleepless nights by translating Greek epigrams into Latin verse, and who never "exerted such steady application as he did in the study of Greek," is no mean authority. Let it also be remembered that the great moralist was a violent High Churchman, a stout champion for the establishment which uses sprinkling for baptism."

Christian Watchman.

TOO MANY PERIODICALS.

I HAVE been waiting for several years to express an opinion which I have been afraid to express—afraid lest that opinion should be suspected of improper motives; or if it should not, that it might wound the feelings of some young prophet or good brother, whose feelings I would not hurt for a whole period of the best periodical in the State of Virginia. I have therefore waited for a favorable moment to express

the aforesaid opinion, and have repeatedly thought that if I could find some six months, during which no one would imagine that he ought to trim his lamp and hang it up in the Tabernacle of Witness, I should muster courage; and in the midst of such a favorable moment I would avow that I entertained an opinion that we had already too many periodicals. But such a favorable crisis not having arrived, and no likelihood of its arriving for some years to come, I have at length rallied all my forces, and I now affirm that I am of opinion that we have too many periodicals. I do this, too, at the very time that I announce the conception of a new one. But I know the brother who has issued this prospectus, and therefore I am not afraid of offending him. I rely on his good sense, and knowledge of my views to him long since expressed, for an apology for all I may now say on this subject. He is the last man, too, in my knowledge that ought to undertake such a thing—not for the lack of talent, of zeal, of the means of carrying it on, with such good and able auxiliaries as are with him in this project; but because he has already expended thousands in the gratuitous distribution of books. I had thought that his experience in the first volume of the "Disciple" would satisfy his zeal in that branch of benevolent enterprize.

But the present prospectus excepted, (and I may say that I sincerely wish our brother all success in his laudable zeal for the dissemination of light,) I proceed to state my reasons why there should be a *contraction* rather than an expansion of the periodical zeal.

1st. Brethren are spending their time in editorial duties that could be much better employed in the field, laboring in the word and teaching. I have heard many brethren say that they would rather pay the preacher extra for the labors of his tongue than for those of his pen; because they regard his personal labors in preaching of much more utility to the world than his writings. In proof of this fact it is alleged that those brethren who labor much with the pen have greatly retired from the public ministrations of the word.

2d. In the next place there is an unnecessary taxing of the reading community to support so many papers, when one or two could engross all the useful information communicated in them all, and be afforded at a lower price, in consequence of an enlarged patronage.

3d. In the third place, we editors are all fond of distinguishing ourselves by some original ideas, or some new discoveries; and we rack our brains to find out what is *new*, rather than to ascertain what is *good* and *useful*. Hence the many new speculations which have, like muahrooms, sprung up and withered again, for the sake of edifying the community, by showing how little good there is in being wise above what is written, or above our brother editors.

4th. In the fourth place the elementary principles are lost sight of, and the more useful readings have to give place for the sake of hearing what A, B, C, and D have to say on the subject.

5th. In the fifth place there is a query offered to our consideration, of some difficulty and of some importance, which may deserve a year's reflection, It is this:—"*When a community is once organized, has every member of it, on his own motion, a right to appear as its public advocate, either as a preacher or an editor, or ought he to wait for a call and an appointment from that community?*"

How much the cause we have espoused has suffered by young and inexperienced men assuming the responsibilities of preachers and editors *on their own motion*, is not for me nor any one else to say; but that it has suffered much injury from such hands I am as fully persuaded as I am of the truth of the gospel itself. Perhaps it is impossible to prevent this altogether; but certainly it may be prevented to a good degree. A project of uniting half a dozen of periodicals in one, and of appointing a person as editor; and afterdefraying all the expenses the surplus to go into a fund for the use of Evangelists, has also been suggested. In such cases the writing talent might enrich the columns of a weekly sheet, and for less expense the community would be better supplied than it now is. This project contemplates but two papers—a Monthly Quarterly Review, and a large Weekly News-Letter, containing news from the churches, and matters and things moral, ecclesiastic, and religious. But I have neither time nor space to speculate on these matters now.

I wish our brethren of Alabama all success in their undertaking, having much confidence in their judgment of what is fitting, and of their ability to make their paper useful and interesting. A. C.

PROSPECTUS

For publishing, in the town of Haynesville, Lowndes county, Alabama, a religious periodical, to be entitled

THE DISCIPLE.

THE BEST WAY TO SEE DIVINE LIGHT, IS TO PUT OUT OUR OWN CANDLE.

James A. Butler and James H. Curtis, aided by several literary, talented, and experienced brethren, propose to publish the second volume of the DISCIPLE, formerly edited by Messrs. Butler and Graham, in Tuscaloosa. We are encouraged in this undertaking from the good success which the first volume of the Disciple met, both as to patronage and conquest over sectarian delinquencies. It is important that those who feel an interest in the cause of Jesus Christ, should bestir themselves for its emancipation from the thraldom of sectarian bondage. One of the emphatic and awful mandates of Jehovah is found in Rev xviii. 4—5. "Come out of her (Babylon) my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not her plagues; for her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities." Christians should not sleep upon their posts, because *time*, the material of which life is composed, lingers not. In its onward current to the ocean of vast eternity, it carries with it all the busy tribes of men. Our Fathers have long since been removed—The Prophets, where are they; do they exist forever? The Apostles ran their race, finished their course; and made their exit to receive the crown which the Lord the righteous Judge had promised. Countless successions of men have arisen—acted out their part, and given way to new actors; who constantly teem forth upon the great stage, and as constantly yield their places, and retire from the scene. "Lord teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom."

The year one thousand eight hundred and forty now looks us in the face. Eighteen hundred annual revolutions have consummated their round since Messiah arose from the vault of the grave—since the triumphal song was sung by the redeemed "Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ—For this corruptible *must* put on incorruption; and this mortal immortality" Since the dirge of corruptibility, death, and the grave, was tuned by the ransomed sons of Zion, "O Death, where is thy sting? O Grave, where is thy victory?" Death isswallowed up in Victory! A new age is on the eve of being born; and the great Regeneration is close at hand. The foundations of political superstructures are dilapidating and crumbling to dust; the trophies of sanguinary victory—the triumphal arches of bloody conquest, and the pyramids of impolitic, pageant national greatness, all manifest upon their faded brow, the imbecility of human policy, to instruct man in the knowledge of his rights. A deep-toned expectation—an anxious, an eager longing for some great change, the sure harbinger of a tremendous system of revolutions, is depicted in the expressive, pensive countenances of all who think and believe that the Lord Almighty reigns. The Jew and Greek anxiously unite in anticipation of one great personage, that shall deliver from the present confusion, anarchy and misrule which obtains every where, whose right to rule the nations none can question nor dare to dispute. Our puny party jealousies and strifes—our religious bickerings and feuds, are all clear arguments, and irresistible too, that the Christian profession has, in the long night of error, mistook its course, and been thrown off the foundation stone laid by God in Zion.

In the prosecution of our editorial labors, we must be honest and faithful. The Bible cannot be compromised with priestcraft, nor the humanized formularies, and ecclesiastical creeds of the age, which tyrannize, with unspeakable usurpation, over the consciences of thousands of our race. "The Bible—the Bible is the religion of Protestants." To it we *will* adhere. We now ask the good and pious of Christ's ranks, to panoply themselves, and walk forth upon the battle-field, unsheath the sword of the spirit, which is the Word of God, and open rencounter against the Man of Sin. May the Lord's cause triumph.

Bragg's Store, Lowndes county, Ala., JAMES A. BUTLER,
August 8, 1839. JAMES H. CURTIS,

CONDITIONS.

The Disciple will comprise a pamphlet of 24 pages octavo, to be published monthly, on fair type and fine paper, at $2,50 per annum, payable within the year.

Hayneville, Lowndes county, Alabama, has been selected as the point of publication, on account of its happy location in many respects for such an enterprize, and in the midst of intelligence and Christian toleration. It will be published by Brother E. W. Thompson, who is duly authorized to receive subscriptions to the work, and to pass receipts, until otherwise directed.

We solicit contributions from our brethren generally, whose Essays and Communications may be addressed to James A. Butler, Bragg's Store, Lowndes county, Alabama.

News from the Churches.

Bedford, Lawrence county, Indiana, September 22d, 1839.

In noticing the record of our Indiana statistics, as reported at our co-operation meeting in June last, at Indianapolis, I was sorry to see some worthy names left entirely out of the account. As you have suggested that the secret of success consists in concert of action, I will tender you the following in addition to the account as given by brother F. W. Emmons:—

In the State of Indiana on apostolic ground, about	15,000
Qualified for laboring Evangelists,	100
In the field now laboring, about	20
Itinerating occasionally, about	50
Qualified for Ruling Elders and Teaching Bishops, not less than	150

As our excellent brother John Taffe from Kentucky, with others made request for the names of the Preaching Brethren of our co-operation, and of our state, I'll here attempt to numerate the most prominent:—

John O'Kane, Michael Combs, James M. Mathes, of Gosport, Owen county, Isaac Newton Short, Gilbert T. Harney, John M. Harris, Dr. W. W. Waters, A. P. Law, Dr. A. P. Ringer, Samuel K. Hoshour, John Longley, Ryland T. Brown, M. D., John B. New, Thomas Lockhart, A. Prather, Joseph Hostitler, Joseph L. Fassett, John L. Jones, Elijah Goodwin, Thomas J. Matlock, C. W. Short, Daniel Baldridge, William Newland, N. Waters, A. & A. Kern, A. Sears, J. & C. Hostitler, George Housler, J. C. Barnes, William Gouge, John Mullis, Samuel Swinsford, Thomas C. Johnson, of Spencer, Peter H. Roberts, Obadiah Winters, James Smith, John P. Thompson, Job Combs, A. Littell, Peter Wright, J. G. Ellis, William Tichenon, Christopher Wilson, Richard Lane, William Thompson, Watson Clark, Levi Fleming, D. D. Hall, M. D., Chancey Butler, Jacob Daubenspike, Gabriel McDuffie, E. Martindale, Joseph Wilson, B. W. Fields, A. M. Dalman, Movety, Weekly, Devee, and many others quite efficient in word and doctrine. We formerly had three other quite distinguished laborers, W. R. Trimble, H. D. Palmer, and D. Warford, now of Illinois. There has been some 200 added since the meeting in June of my knowing in the state. And by request I give the following condensed report:

Church of Christ on White Lick, Morgan county, formerly Baptist Elders,	no.
Butterfield, Craig and Noble,	47
Church of Christ on Stots Creek, Johnson county, John Mullis,	46
" " Clear Creek, Monroe county,	40
" " Buck Creek, Morgan county, Wm. Baker,	30
" " Richland Creek, Green county, John Nance,	25
" " Carters' Creek, Orange county, Thos. and Hiram Green,	47
" " Stampers Creek, M. Movety and D. Johnson,	40
" " Cane Creek, Fink county,	40
" " Lick Creek,	10
" " at Bluff Springs, J. Hollowell,	50
" " on Mill Creek, Washington county, Jordain Johnson, Peter Wright, S. K. Porter,	200
Church of Christ called Bethel, Harrison county, including members about Greenville, Adam Sears, George H. Hon, and D. Teuts,	70
Church of Christ at Mooresville, Floyd county, Chancy and P. Smith,	30

I am credibly informed there are about one thousand in Harrison, Dubois, and adjoining counties, of which we have not, nor can we give any direct report at present.

Timely notices prepare the way: brother G. H. Hon is on his way for an excursion and an evangelizing tour in Georgia—Debuts for Union county. I may perhaps pass the winter in that mild climate, as consumption and dispeptic habits are hereditary with me, knowing that all things work together for the good of those who, with patience, do the will of God; in which I ever hope to be yours and all the saints, in the hope of life and immortality.

JOHN B. HAYWARD.

North Middletown, September 27th, 1839.

You desire to know the number of churches in Bourbon county, their names, number, &c. &c. There are eight churches located in the county, and two others immediately on the lines of Fayette and Harrison. About one half of each of the latter congregations live in our county, to wit:

Leesburg, Harrison county, total 253, half - - - - - - - - - 126
Elders, Coppage and Wasson; Evangelist, John A. Gano.
Union, Fayette county, total 150, half - - - - - - - - - 75
No officers. John A. Gano their preacher.

Bourbon County.

1. Coopers' Run, members - - - - - - - - - - - 40
No officers. John A. Gano their preacher.
2. Paris, members - - - - - - - - - - - 214
Elders, Riggs and Bledsoe. A. Raines preacher.
3. Mount Carmel, members - - - - - - - - - - - 120
No officers. Joshua Irvine preacher
4. Cane Ridge, members - - - - - - - - - - - 220
Elders John Irvine and William P. Payne. Deacons, Hamilton Wilson and H. Rogers. Thomas Bledsoe and John Rogers preachers.
5. Flat Run, members - - - - - - - - - - - 80
Elders, Parker and Morrow.
6. Millersburgh, members - - - - - - - - - - - 160
Elders, Joseph Irvine and ———. Deacons Bills and Taylor. A. Raines preacher.
7. Clintonsville, members - - - - - - - - - - - 80
Deacons, H. Curtwright and J Crose. John Rogers preacher.
8. North Middletown, members - - - - - - - - - - - 300
Elders, John Rash, William Mason, and N. L. Lindsay. Deacons, E. Darnall, James Ford, and Devall Payne. A. Raines preacher.
Total number of members, - - - - - - - - - - - 1435

in eight churches situated in the county, and including the half of two others located on the line—namely: Leesburg and Union, as above described. Seven of these congregations own the houses at which they meet The other three own but half a house, to wit: Leesburg, Union, and Millersburgh.

Enclosed I send ten dollars, which credit as follows:—John Campbell, sen., James Houston, John Thomas, Elias Darnall, Devall Payne.

By mistake this letter was not forwarded according to date at the head.
October 4th, 1839. N. L. LINDSAY.

Louisville, Kentucky, October 9th, 1839.

Brothers Morton, Pinkerton, Helen; and myself, have this day closed a meeting at Goose Creek, Jefferson county, 9 miles above us, where 27 souls were obedient to the Lord; many of whom were in the days of their youth,—and some of the most interesting young ladies in that region. We left others greatly wounded; and a most excellent impression upon the neighborhood. Brother Pinkerton and myself leave in the morning at the call of the brethren in Madison, Indiana, to hold a protracted meeting. Through his blessing we hope to conquor some aliens, and unite them to our King's Dominions. The Lord be praised for his goodness.

During the last 2 weeks there has been 5 immersed at New Albany, 1 at Jeffersonville, and 3 in this city. Brother Pinkerton immersed some 6 or 7 in other portions of this county during the same time. G. W. ELLY.

We have had a pleasant and refreshing visit from Brothers A. S. Haden, Dr. Robinson, of Cuyahoga, Ohio, and E. A. Smith, of Kentucky, who held meetings at Dutch Fork, Wellsburg, West Liberty, and Bethany. At those meetings fifty persons were baptized, and added to the Lord. There are now, within a circle of 8 miles from Bethany, five meeting houses, at which weekly meet about 500 disciples of Christ after the primitive and apostolic order.

OBITUARY.—In cordial sympathy with surviving relatives, and in regret for their and our loss, we have to record the death of our much esteemed and beloved brethren, Chauncy Forward, Esq., one of the Elders of the church in Summerset, Pa., on the 9th October;—and on the same day, that of Elder Harvey Goodwine. These brethren died in the faith and hope of that gospel which, in this life they adorned. A. C.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME III.——NUMBER XII.

BETHANY, VA. *DECEMBER*, 1839.

OUR NAME.

Brother Campbell,

I PERCEIVE that a discussion has lately arisen respecting the name which we shall bear. This is doubtless an interesting question; and I consider it quite fortunate that we have not been deprived, by any officious sponsors, of the privilege of giving ourselves a name; but that now, having attained to years of discretion, we can please our own taste, and enjoy the pleasure of our own christening.

It is not to be expected, however, that such a controversy as this will be brought to a speedy issue. On the contrary, as it relates to words, and words are wind, it is likely to be very wordy, or long-winded; for I presume it will hold good here, as well as elsewhere, that "what is born of wind is wind." It is, indeed, remarkable how words have the power of multiplying and magnifying themselves, so that the simplest and smallest term uttered in the breath of "silky soft Favonius," shall raise about our ears a very tempest of "words of learned length and thundering sound." Thus in Homer the favoring divinity to insure to Ulysses a prosperous voyage, gives to him the opposing winds which he had the art to enclose in little bags. But these were no sooner opened during the slumbers of Ulysses, by his curious companions, than they swelled out into a storm as broad as the sea and as high as the heavens.

We shall doubtless have a sufficient illustration of this as we proceed. Already has the word "Disciple" enlisted a very respectable force; and, like the fairy pavillion which could be held in the hand when folded, but when opened would cover an immense army, the

name "Christian" has enlarged itself to accommodate three large divisions marshalled under the banners of Patrial, Diminutive, and Patronymic—in themselves a host, and able, one would think, to put to rout a regiment of common militia. By the way, it is certainly quite fortunate for the unpretending word "Disciple" that the grenadier Patronymic has lately fallen away to the service of the Jesuits, who have, it seems by the last advices, with their accustomed ingenuity, quite converted him to the faith.

But to the purpose: There are, it appears, three names already proposed. One suggests "Disciples of Christ," or elliptically "Disciples;" another urges the adoption of the name "Christians;" while a third would amalgamate both, and make peace by making of the twain one new name—"Christian Disciples." It is said of Sir Roger de Coverly, that, when pressed in argument, he was wont to end the matte by pleasantly observing, "Well, I see that much may be said upon both sides." Now, the matter is this: The question before us has already *three* sides as just stated, and I propose to add a fourth to it; for certainly if much may be said when there are but two sides, more may be urged when there are three, and most of all when we have four.

In the first place, however, let us endeavor to see clearly what the question is. It is not, if I have understood it, What shall others call us? but, What shall we call ourselves? "If we miscall ourselves," you remark, "the sin is ours; it is theirs [our neighbors'] if they do t." We cannot, indeed, expect any thing else but that others will miscall us, for "the world knoweth us not;" and if men do not know who and what we are, it would be strange if they should name us right. But as we ourselves are, or ought to be, duly apprized of all this, it will most assuredly be our own fault if we do not give ourselves a good name. Nevertheless, I am not sure that the debaters have really addressed themselves to this business, for they seem to me to look over the question, What shall we call ourselves? to the first one, What shall others call us? and to approve or reject according as *others* are supposed to feel and judge. Hence one name is disapproved because *others* will consider it too indefinite; another is objected to because *others* will associate with it sentiments which we disavow, and the object would appear to be to choose one by which *others* may designate us as a religious denomination. This I conceive to be a matter of small concern, compared with the adoption of a name by which we shall be known to one another and to ourselves. People are too fond of calling us names, to yield the privilege to us, and they will no doubt continue to please in this respect their own fancy. But it is

very important that we should choose for ourselves a name so significant and appropriate, that we shall always know exactly who we are, and what we are. We will thus be free from any danger of confounding ourselves with others; or of being mistaken in our own identity; and being thus reduced to the dilemma of the "sleeper awakened," who had to call upon an attendant to bite his finger to convince him that he did not merely dream of being the Sultan; and afterwards again was obliged to be severely bastinadoed before he would confess that he was nothing but plain Abon Hassan.

But before I suggest the name which I deem most suitable, allow me to make a remark or two upon those already proposed. The name "Christian" is urged as of divine authority. Of this there is no proof. It is well known that this name was given at first to the ancient disciples in reproach, and by their enemies. The name of Christ was execrated by their persecutors, who made it the criterion of apostacy to blaspheme it. Peter exhorts the believers to rejoice when they were reproached for, or *with*, the name of Christ. It was to them a cause and a part of their persecution to be called Christians; and however they may have *suffered* themselves to be so called, there is no evidence that they adopted the title. That it is not of divine authority may be inferred I think with certainty from the fact, that the writer who states that the disciples were called Christians at Antioch (it would rather have been at *Jerusalem* had it been divine) does not afterwards so call them, but continues to use the word "disciple." Now it is worthy of remark, that when the names of Sarah and Abram are changed by divine authority, the writer who records the circumstance does always afterwards use the new names Sarah and Abraham. Were there the same divine warrant for the change of Disciple to Christian, the sacred historian Luke would have been guided by the same inspiration to the same consistency.

It is a strong objection to the adoption of the name "Christian," that it does not at all express the same idea now which it did anciently. It then simply denoted a follower of Christ; one who acknowledged Christ as his leader, without any special reference to character; although this, when brought into question, was supposed to be abominable by the idolators, who regarded the disciples as atheists and haters of mankind. Now, on the contrary, this term is used almost exclusively in reference to character, and denotes one who has attained to the highest moral and religious eminence. It was formerly a reproach, but it is now an honor. Hence to assume it at present is to bestow upon each other the highest compliment and encomium; and to claim from others a degree of consideration and respect for a mere title, which they have been accustomed to pay only to character.

The name "Disciples of Christ" is liable to this objection also, though I grant that if every body understood Latin they would see a redeeming virtue in the humility implied by the word *disciple* or *learner*. It is undeniable that this name is used first of all, and very frequently in the New Testament. But it is now understood in a different sense; and, like the name "Christian," means too much to suit the case so well, I think, as the one I am about to mention. Upon the whole, however, if it were allowable for us to have two or three names, and I do not see why we should not have four or five—a thing which, by the bye, is not unfashionable in modern times, I would willingly adopt "Disciples" as one of them.

But inasmuch as we are now in search of the *best* name, I take the liberty to suggest "Brethren," or "Brother" in the singular, as the most suitable. This, I think, will appear from a few considerations:—

1st. While it is used interchangeably in the scriptures with the word "disciple" so as to have equal authority, it occurs much more frequently.

2d. It was used by Christ and the Apostles as a designation. "Ye are all brethren"—"Holy brethren"—"If any one *called* a brother," &c.

3d. Being derived from a natural relation which is immutable, it expresses the same idea now as formerly, which is not true of the others.

4th. It is most free from any appearance of assumption or arrogance.

5th. It is much more applicable. And here it is that I wish to be more particular, as in this consists the chief merit of a name. There are two things conspicuous among brethren—affection and familiarity. Every one expects brethren to have fraternal affection, and every body knows that brethren can take the greatest liberties with one another. I would not say that where there is the greatest familiarity there is the greatest affection. The reverse of this I believe to be true. But among many brethren we shall find some conspicuous for affection, and others for a disposition to use freedoms. This is so both in the natural and spiritual relation, and it is most evidently true of us as a religious community. Here is one, for instance, who, desiring to have the pre-eminence, and preferring the praise of men to the praise of God, seeks every opportunity to plume himself with the well-earned reputation of his brother. In all the phraseology of affection, and with th greatest politeness in the world, he takes the liberty to charge upon his very dear brother, and that too publicly and in print, usurpation injustice, plagiarism, falsehood, profanity. Presuming upon the ne ar-

ness of the relation, he seeks every occasion to jeer, insult, and abuse him, supposing that, as a matter of course, it must all be taken in good part. And while under the hood of brotherly affection he hides the two faces of jealousy and pride, he thinks that under a disguise so amiable he is free to follow his inclinations. Does such a one as this deserve to be called Christian in the modern sense of that word? I trow not. And I am surprized that such a one should wish to have this title adopted, when the name Brother affords to such freedoms a covert so much more ample. Indeed it has been regarded as giving an unbounded license from the time of the first brothers, one of whom took the liberty to put the other to death because he himself was less honored. Similar to this was the freedom which Jacob took with Amasa when he called him brother, and history is full of such instances.

I would by no means be understood to propose such examples as these for imitation. As the greater includes the less, I only wish to show by these how great liberties people take under the designation of brethren. And this is only one instance of many. Brethren can call a man from his family and his business, and send him to labor in the gospel; and after he has expended all his means, leave him in penury and distress. Brethren can borrow from one another, and pay not again. Brethren can enter into engagements with each other, and be careless of fulfilling them. But I have neither time nor inclination to detail all that "Brethren" can do, and yet still continue to be brethren as before, although it would be quite impossible for them under the same circumstances to be Christians in the sense which the moderns attach to that word. I conceive, therefore, that the name proposed is the most applicable.

I should be sorry, however, to think that it did not apply also in other cases as expressive of that true and sincere affection which I trust exists among the majority, of which there cannot be a better proof than the forbearance and long-suffering with which such liberties as are above mentioned have been endured. On all these accounts I do not think that any name can be chosen which will so completely cover the whole ground—which will give such allowance to existing familiarity, and afford such free and abundant scope for the exercise of the warmest and purest feelings of fraternal affection.

Yours truly, D. A.

A RETORT.—A young clergyman having, in the hearing of Dr. Parr, stated that he would believe nothing he could not understand, "Then, young man," said the Doctor, "your creed will be the shortest of any man's I ever knew."

For practical good views and good sense on the "*power of godliness*," I exchange with no paper of more merit than the "Oberlin Evangelist." I extract from No. XVII., July 31, the following discourse on Romans xiii. 8. I think it is substantially orthodox, and I should like to see it fully tested by being reduced to practice, that we might prove by experiment whether the doctrine be sound—that is, healthful. A. C.

BEING IN DEBT.

TEXT.—Rom. xiii. 8. "Owe no man any thing."

IN discussing this subject we design to show—

I. THE MEANING OF THE TEXT.

II. THAT TO BE IN DEBT IS SIN.

III. THE DUTY OF THOSE WHO ARE IN DEBT.

1st. *I am to show the meaning of the text.*

The meaning of this text, like most others, is to be learned from a careful examination of the verses in its connexion. The Apostle begins the chapter by enforcing the duty of obedience to civil magistrates.

"Let every soul be subject to the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever, therefore, resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God, and they that resist shall receive unto themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou, then, not be afraid of the power? Do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same. For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain, for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must be subject not only for wrath, but for conscience sake. For, for this cause pay ye tribute also, for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing."

They are the servants of God, employed for your benefit. You are therefore to pay them tribute—i. e. give them the support which their circumstances require.

In the light of this and various other passages of scripture, I have often wondered how it was possible that any person could call in question the duty of obeying civil magistrates; or how they could call in question the right and duty of magistrates to inflict civil penalties, and even capital punishment, where the natute of the case demands it.—Certainly this passage recognizes their right and their duty "to execute wrath" upon transgressors, as the servants and executioners of God's vengeance.

"Render, therefore, to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor. Owe no man any thing, but to love one another; for he that loveth another hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet, and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, viz.—Thou shalt love thy neighbor as

thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore, love is the fulfilling of the law."

From this connexion it is evident that the Apostle designed to teach, that whenever we come to owe a man, we should immediately pay him; and not suffer any debt or obligation to rest upon us undischarged.

"Owe no man any thing, but to love one another." Here the Apostle recognizes the truth that love is of perpetual obligation, and that this obligation can never be so cancelled or discharged as to be no longer binding. He recognizes no other obligation except love, with its natural fruits, as being, in its own nature, of perpetual obligation.

In respect to this obligation, all that we can do is to fulfil it every moment; without the possibility of so fulfilling it as to set aside the continued obligation to love.

But we are to owe no man any thing else but love. We are to "render to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; honor to whom honor."

I understand the text, then, simply to mean, Let no obligation but that of love, with its natural fruits, which is, from its very nature, a perpetual obligation, rest upon you undischarged.

I am aware that some modern critics maintain that this passage should have been rendered indicatively. But such men as Doddridge, and Henry, Barnes, and Professor Stuart, are of opinion that its imperative rendering is correct. And all are agreed that the doctrine of this text, as it stands, is plainly a doctrine of the Bible.

Here the question arises, What is it to owe a man in the sense of this text? I answer—

1st. If you *employ* a laborer, and do not stipulate the time and terms of payment, it is taken for granted that he is to be paid when his work is done, and to have the money. If you hire him for a day, and nothing is said to the contrary, he cannot demand his pay till his day's work is done. Till then you owe him nothing. The same is true if you hire him for a week, or a month, or a year. When the time which he is to labor is stipulated, and nothing is said about the time and terms of payment, you owe him nothing—i. e. nothing is due him till his time has expired. Then you owe him, and then you are bound to pay him, and pay him the money. But if the time was not specified which he was to labor, he may break off at any time, and demand pay for what he has done. Or if the time of payment was expressed or understood, whenever it arrives you then owe him, and are bound to pay him agreeably to the understanding.

2d. The same is true if you hire a horse, or any other piece of property. If you hire it for a specified time, and nothing is said of the conditions of payment, the understanding is that you are to pay when the time for which the property was hired has expired. It then becomes a debt. Then you are to pay, and pay the money. If there were any other understanding, fixing the time and terms of payment, you do not owe the man until the specified conditions are complied with.

3d. The same is true if you *purchase* any piece of property. If nothing is stipulated to the contrary, the understanding is that you are to pay the cash at the time you receive the property. At that time, and neither before nor after, you are expected to pay the purchase money.

We do not properly owe an individual until we are under an obligation to pay him. Whenever he has a right to demand the pay, we have no right to withhold it.

There may be such a thing as contracting a prospective debt, giving your obligation to become due at a certain time. But then you do not properly owe, because you are under no obligation to pay till it becomes due. But whenever it becomes due you are bound immediately to pay.

II. *I am to show that it is a sin to be in debt.*

1st. Because it is a *direct violation of the command of God.* This text is just as binding as any command of the decalogue; and a violation of it is a setting aside the command of Jehovah, as much as to commit adultery or murder. It is not to be regarded merely as a piece of advice given by the Apostle; but as a direct, and positive, and authoritative command of God.

2d. It is *unjust to be in debt.* If your creditor has a right to demand payment, you certainly have no right to withhold it. If it is due, it is a contradiction to say that it is not unjust in you not to pay. It is a contradiction both in *terms* and in *fact*, to say that you owe a man, and at the same time are guilty of no injustice in refusing or neglecting to pay him. It is as much injustice as *stealing*, and involves the same principle. The *sin* of stealing consists in the appropriating to ourselves that which properly belongs to another. Therefore, whenever you withhold from any man his due, you are guilty of as absolute injustice as if you stole his property.

3d. It is sin, *because it is falsehood.* I have already shown that you do not properly owe a man till it becomes due. It becomes due when and because there is a promise on your part expressed or implied, that you will pay it at that time. Now you cannot violate this promise without being guilty of falsehood.

4th. If what has just been said is true, it follows that men should *meet their contracts* as they would avoid the grossest sin. They are bound to avoid being in debt—to meet and fulfil their engagements, as much as they are bound to to avoid blasphemy, idolatry, murder, or any other sin. And a man who does not pay his debts is no more to be accounted an honest man, than he who is guilty of any other heinous crime.

5th. If a professor of religion is in debt, he is a *moral delinquent*, and should be accounted and treated as a subject of church discipline.

Objection.—It may be said, I cannot avoid being in debt. I answer to this—

That if you cannot pay, you could have avoided contracting the debt, and was bound to do so.

Do you reply, I really needed the thing which I purchased.

I ask, Were your necessities so great that you would have been justified, in your estimation, in lying or stealing to supply them? If not, why have you resorted to fraud? The same authority that prohibits lying or stealing, prohibits your owing a man. Why, then, do you violate this commandment of God, any more than the other? Is it not because a corrupt public sentiment has rendered the violation of this commandment less disgraceful than to violate these other commands of God? Why did you not resort to begging instead of running

in debt? Better far to beg than to run in debt. Begging is not prohibited by any command of God, but being in debt is prohibited. True, it is disgraceful to beg; but a God-dishonoring public sentiment has rendered it far less so to be in debt. And does not this account for your shameless violation of this command of God?

Do you say again, I have been disappointed; I expected to have had the money; I made the contract in good faith, and expected to meet it at the time: but others owe me and do not pay me, therefore I am unable to pay my debts. To this I reply—

You should have contracted with that expressed condition. You should have made known your circumstances, and the ground of your expectation in regard to being able to pay at the time appointed. In that case, if your creditor was willing to run the risk of your being disappointed, the fault is not yours, as you have practised no injustice or deception. But if your contract was without condition, you have taken upon yourself the risk of disappointment, and are not guiltless.

But here it may be said again, Nearly the whole church are in debt; and if subject to discipline, who shall cast the first stone? I reply—

(1.) If it be true that the church is so extensively in debt, no wonder that the curse of God is upon her.

(2.) Again, it may be true that a church may be so generally involved in any given sin as to make that sin a difficult subject of discipline, because each man knows that he himself is guilty, and must in his turn submit to the same discipline. But when that is true of any church, it is a shameless abomination for the members of that church to attempt to hide themselves under the admitted fact that nearly all the church are involved in the guilt of it.

Now rest assured, that when any sin becomes so prevalent that it cannot be made, and is not made in that church, a subject of discipline, God himself will sooner or later take up the rod, and find means to discipline, and that effectually, such a church.

III. *I am to show the duty of those who are in debt.*

1. They are bound to make any *sacrifice* of property or time, and indeed *any sacrifice* that it is possible for them to make, to pay their debts.

Here it may be asked again, Does the law of love permit my creditor to demand a sacrifice of me? If he loves me as he does himself, why should he require, or even allow me to make a sacrifice of property to pay what I owe him? I reply—

(1.) If any one is to make a sacrifice or suffer loss, it is the debtor, and not the creditor. It will almost certainly be some damage to him to be disappointed in not receiving his due. It may so disarrange his affairs, and break in upon his calculations, as to occasion him great damage. Of this he is to be the judge.

(2.) Your sacrifice may be necessary not only to prevent his *loss*, but to enable him to meet his contracts, and thus prevent his *sin*. His confidence in your veracity may have led him to contract prospective debts, and by not paying him, you not only sin yourself, but cause him to sin.

(3.) The refusal of one to make a sacrifice to pay his debts, may involve many others in both *loss* and *gain*. A owes B, B owes C, and

C owes D, and so on in a long chain of mutual dependencies. Now if there be a failure in the first or any other link of this chain, all below it are involved in loss and sin. Now where shall this evil be arrested?

Suppose you hold the place of C. A refuses to make a sacrifice to pay B, and B to pay you. Shall you sin because they do, and involve your creditor in loss and sin? No. Whatever others may do, you are bound to pay your debts. And unless your creditor voluntarily consents to defer the time of payment, you are bound to pay him at any sacrifice.

2. Persons that are in debt should *not contract new debts* to pay old ones. It is the practice of some when they get involved, to keep up their credit by borrowing of one to pay another. Their meeting and cancelling the last debt depends altogether upon the presumption that they shall be able to borrow the money of some body else. When they have borrowed of one they will keep him out of his pay as long as possible without losing their credit. And then, instead of making a sacrifice of property sufficient to discharge the obligation, they borrow from B to pay A, and from C to pay B; and thus, perhaps, disappoint and disoblige a dozen men by not paying them exactly at the time agreed, instead of at once stopping short, and parting with what they have, at any sacrifice, to pay the debt.

I do not say that a man should not, in any case, borrow of one man to pay another. But this I say, that as a general thing, such practices are highly reprehensible. Still, if a debt becomes due, and you have not the money at hand, but are certain that at a given time you shall have it, I do not suppose it wrong for you to borrow and pay this debt, with the understanding that you pay this borrowed money at the time specified. But to borrow money with no other prospect of an ultimate payment than that you can borrow again, and thus keep up your credit from time to time, is wicked.

3. Those who are in debt have no right *to give away* the money which they owe. If you are in debt, the money in your hands belongs to your creditor, and not to you. You have no right, therefore, "to be generous till you are just." You have strictly no more right to give that money away than you have to steal money to give away.

But here it should be particularly understood what *is* and what *is not* to be accounted as giving money away—e. g. it is not giving away your money to pay the current expenses of the congregation to which you are attached. Your proportion of the current expenses of the congregation or church to which you belong is impliedly, if not expressly contracted by you. You cannot withhold it any more than the payment of any other debt.

The same may be said of the support of ministers and foreign missionaries, and all for whose support the faith of the church is pledged. It seems to be a common, but erroneous understanding of professors of religion, that what are more generally called their secular debts or obligations are binding, and are to be discharged of course. But that their obligations, expressed or implied, to religious institutions are not so absolutely binding; and of course they can *give* nothing, as they express it, to these objects until their debts are paid. Now, beloved, you ought to know, that to the support of the institutions of religion you are pledged, both virtually and actually, by your profession; and that

these are your most sacred debts, and are thus to be considered and discharged by you. I beseech you not to consider the meeting and cancelling of such demands as these in the light of a *gift*—as if you were making God a present instead of discharging a solemn debt. I have been astonished to find that the pecuniary embarrassments of the few past years have so far crippled the movements of the great benevolent societies for want of funds; and that Missionaries, for whose support the faith and honor of the church were pledged, should be so far cut short of their necessary supplies, under the pretence that the church must pay her secular debts before she could discharge her high and sacred obligations to them, and the work in which they are engaged.

4. A person in debt has no right to purchase for himself or family things not absolutely essential for their subsistence. Things that might lawfully be purchased and used under other circumstances, become unlawful when you are in debt.

A creditor has no right to deprive you of necessary food and indispensable raiment, or of your liberty. To do so would put it out of your power ever to pay. But you have no right to indulge in any thing more than the necessaries of life while your debts are unpaid. To do so is as unlawful as it would be to steal to purchase unnecessary articles.

REMARKS.

1. From what has been said it is plain that the whole credit system, if not absolutely sinful, is nevertheless so highly dangerous that no Christian should embark in it.

Since the preaching of this sermon, this remark has been censured as a rash one. A rash remark! Let the present history and experience of the church say whether the credit system is not so highly dangerous that the man who will venture to embark in it is guilty of rashness and presumption. When has religion for centuries been so generally disgraced, as by the bankruptcy of its professors within the last few years? And how many millions of money are now due from church members to ungodly men that will never be paid? Rash! Why this is the very plea of the church, that they can do nothing for the support of the gospel, because they are so much in debt. Is there no danger of any man's getting in debt who attempts to trade upon a borrowed capital? Indeed it is highly dangerous, as universal experience shows.

And what is the necessity, I pray, for Christians to embark in so dangerous an enterprize, and one that so highly jeopardizes the honor of religion? Is it because the necessaries of life can be procured in no other way? Is it because the institutions of religion demand it? Religion sustains a greater loss through the debts and bankruptcies of Christians, than it ever gains by their prosperity.

But the credit system, as it now prevails and has prevailed, is useless and worse than useless; e. g. suppose the consumers of merchandize, instead of anticipating their yearly crops and yearly income, and running in debt with the expectation of paying from these, were to take a little pains to reverse this order of things, and be a year beforehand, paying down for what they purchase, and having the income of each year beforehand, so as to contract no debts. In this case the

country merchants, giving no credit, but receiving ready pay, would be able to pay down on the purchase of their goods from the wholesale dealer—the wholesale dealer would pay down to the importer—the importer to the manufacturer—and the manufacturer to the producer.

Now any man can see that many millions a-year would be saved to this country in this way. The manufacturer could afford an article cheaper for ready pay—and so could the importer and the wholesale dealer; and each in his turn, down to the consumer. Every one could sell cheaper for ready pay, as no risk would be run, and business could be done with much greater convenience and safety. Thus an entire rejection of the credit system, in its present form, and the adoption of the system of ready pay, would afford to the consumer every article so much cheaper as to save millions of dollars every year. And I do not apprehend that there is in reality any serious difficulty in so reversing the whole order of business.

At another time I may more particularly examine the credit system in its foundation and various ramifications, and the nature and tendencies of the prevailing system of doing business on borrowed capital. But at present I can only say, as I have said, that, waiving the question whether it is absolutely sinful in itself, it is too highly dangerous to be embarked in by those who feel a tender solicitude for the honor and cause of Christ.

2. That if in any case the present payment of debts is impossible, your duty is to regard your indebtedness as a sin against God and your neighbor—to repent, and set yourself with all practicable self-denial, to pay as fast as you can. And unless you are laying yourself out to pay your debts, do not imagine that you repent either of your indebtedness or any other sin. For you are impenitent, and a shameless hypocrite rather than a Christian, if you suffer yourself to be in debt, and are not making all practicable efforts to do justice to your creditors.

3. If payment is *possible*, by any sacrifice of property on your part, sin is upon you till you do pay. There is a wicked custom among men, and to a considerable extent in the church, of putting property out of their hands to avoid a sacrifice in the payment of their debts.

As an instance, take the elder whom I mentioned in a former lecture, who confessed to me that "he was avoiding the sacrifice of his property, in payment of his debts, by *finesse* of law."

4. The lax notions and practices of the world and of the church upon this subject, are truly abominable. It has come to pass, that a man may not only be considered a respectable citizen, but a respectable member of the church, who suffers himself to be in debt—who has judgments and executions against him, and who resorts not only "to *finesse* of law to avoid the payment of his debts," but who practises the most palpable frauds against both God and man, by putting his property out of his hands to avoid meeting his just responsibilities.

O shame on the church and on these professors of religion! Some of them will even go to an unconverted lawyer for advice in this iniquitous business, and lay open before his unconverted heart their shameless iniquity. Alas! how many lawyers are thus led to call in question the whole truth of the Christian Religion; and over these dishonest professors they stumble into hell. And until the church

will rise up and wash her hands, and cleanse her garments from this iniquity, by banishing such persons from her communion, the cause of Christ will not cease to bleed at every pore.

5. Some persons take the ground that not to meet their contracts and pay their debts when they become due, is not sinful, on account of the general understanding of business men upon such subjects. To this I answer—

(1.) There is no understanding among business men, that debts are not to be paid when they become due. Among that class of men the non-payment of a debt always involves a disgrace, and a wrong, even in their own estimation.

(2,) Let the public sentiment be what it might among business men, still the law of God cannot be altered; and by this unchanging law it is a sin to be in debt. And as "sin is a disgrace to any people," it is both a *sin* and a *shame* to be in debt.

6. The rule laid down in this text is applicable not only to individuals, but to corporations, and nations, and all bodies of men assuming pecuniary responsibilities.

7. It is *dishonest* and *dishonorable* to hire or purchase an article, and say nothing about payment till afterwards.

8. The violation of this law is working immense mischief in the church and in the world. It is truly shocking to see to what an extent the church is involved in debt, and church members are engaged in collecting debts of each other by force of law. The heart-burnings and bitterness that exist among church members on account of the non-payment of their debts to each other, are awfully great and alarming,

Besides all this, in what light does the church appear before the world—as a mass of money-makers, and speculators, and bankrupts—shuffling and managing through *finesse* of law to avoid the payment of their debts?

I could relate facts within my own knowledge, and many of them too, that would cause the cheek of piety to blush. Alas! for the rage and madness of a speculating, money-making, fraudulent church!

9. There is great reason to believe that many young men, in the course of their education, involve themselves in debts, that so far eat up their piety as to render them nearly useless all their days. I would sooner be twenty-five years in getting an education, and paying my way, than involve myself in debt to the Education Society, or in any other way.

How many young men there are who are in debt to the Education Society, and who are dealing very loosely with their consciences on the subject of payment. Because the Education Society do not press them right up, they let the matter lie along from time to time—increase their expenditures, as their income may increase, instead of practising self-denial, and honestly discharging their obligations to the Society.

10. I cannot have *confidonce* in the piety of any man who is not *conscientious* in the payment of his debts. I know some men who are in debt, and who spend their time and their property in a manner wholly inconsistent with their circumstances, and still make great pretensions to piety. They are active in prayer meetings—take a conspicuous place at the communion table—and even hold a responsible office in

the church of Christ, and yet they seem to have no conscience about paying their debts.

I believe it is right, and the duty of all churches and ministers to exclude such persons from the communion of the church. And were it generally done, it would go far to wipe away the stains that have been brought by such persons upon the religion of Jesus Christ. I do not see why they should be suffered to come to the communion table any more than whoremongers, or murderers, or drunkards, or Sabbath breakers, or slaveholders.

11. There must be a great reformation in the church upon this subject, before the business class of ungodly men will have much confidence in religion. This reformation should begin immediately, and begin where it ought to begin—among the leading members of the church of Christ. Ministers and church judicatories should speak out upon the subject—should "cry aloud and spare not, but lift up their voice like a trumpet and show Israel his transgressions and the house of Jacob their sins."

And now, beloved, are any of you in debt. Then sin is upon you. Rise up, and show yourselves clean in this matter, I beseech you. Make every effort to meet and discharge your responsibilities; and beware that in attempting to pay your debts, you do not resort to means that are as highly reprehensible as to be in debt.

12. Let no one complain, and say, that instead of preaching the gospel I am discussing mere business transactions. The truth is, that the gospel is to regulate the business transactions of the world. Religion is a practical thing. It does not consist in austerities, prayers, and masses, and monkish superstitions, as Papists vainly dream. If religion does not take hold of a man's business operations—if it does not reform his daily life and habits, of what avail is it? Until in these respects your practice is right, you cannot expect to enjoy the influences of the Holy Spirit. You cannot grow in holiness any farther than you reform your practice.

The preceptive part of the gospel, therefore, is to be spread out in all its detail before you. And when you find it "convinces you of sin." I beg of you not to turn round and say that this is preaching about business, and not about religion. What is business but a part of religion? A man that does not consider it so in practice, has no religion at all.

And now, dearly beloved, instead of suffering your heart to rise up and resist what I have said, will you not, as I have often requested, go down upon your knees, and spread this whole subject before the Lord? Will you not inquire wherein you have erred, and sinned, and make haste to repent, and reform your lives?

ORDINATION—*NO. II.*

In my former essay I showed that there is not a single passage in the whole of the New Testament, from beginning to end, which records the fact, that any disciple of Christ ever had hands laid on him to authorize him to preach the gospel and baptize believers. The object of this essay is to ascertain the scriptural use and meaning of the term "*ordination.*"

It is deeply to be deplored that in the common English version of the scriptures there are to be found so many *outlandish* words, which to the common reader can convey no definite signification whatever. Had every word been translated into plain English, and the "*laity*" been permitted to hear the truth in their own mother tongue, the *creed-makers* would have been in a great measure defeated; and the "*clergy*" would have been deprived of one of their most successful methods of imposing on the ignorance and credulity of mankind. Had *Bishops*, which in England has no meaning, except what the reigning Priesthood choose to give it, been translated *Overseer*, then every body would have known, that, in the New Testament, Bishops meant nothing more than the *associate Elders* or *Overseers* of *one* Christian congregation. Had *Minister* been translated *servant*, as it should have been, then the distinctions between *servants* of Christ and *Ministers* of Christ would have been unknown.

How fatal must the base translation of this word have proved to the dominion and arrogant pretensions of the *Clergy*, who impiously dare to lay an *exclusive claim* to the rank of Ministers of the Gospel, and to the right of performing certain parts of the service under the New Constitution—such, especially, as preaching the gospel and "administering its ordinance;" thereby *disfranchising* the great mass of God's "royal Priesthood," and degrading them to the rank of *mere menials* in the Kingdom.

In like manner, if *ordination* had been translated into English, it would have been simply *appointment*. Every appointment, then, no matter to what duty or office, or *in what manner* it might have been made, would have been an "*ordination*." But by *anglicising* the Latin word *ordinatio*, instead of using the English term *appointment*, "ORDINATION" easily comes to have a cabalistic meaning. An ambitious and self-constituted Priesthood can easily attach to the word a signification favorable to their exclusive pretensions, and persuade the 'laity' that it means consecration to the "HOLY MINISTRY" by the laying on of the hands of a duly "ORDAINED MINISTRY."

Oh! for the day when faithful translations of the scriptures into every tongue under heaven shall enable us all, every member of the human family, to learn the truths of scripture, "in that language in which we were born." May God hasten its advent!

When a peculiar meaning, no matter how erroneous, has thus been appropriated to an outlandish word, and that meaning has been extensively incorporated with religious prejudices, it becomes a Herculean task to disabuse the public mind, and restore the word to its true signification.

Ordain, and its derivative ordination, fall within the scope of these remarks. So soon as ordain is heard with reference to religious matters, it is immediately and almost irresistibly inferred that hands were imposed: and he who would question this inference would be regarded as questioning the fact of ordination, and doubting the veracity of the historian. But is this a correct view of the subject? Let us examine a few passages where *ordain* occurs, and see what is the scriptural meaning of the term:—

* *Quere.*—Is there not also, in many cases, the act of instalment?—The ordaining act? T. C.

Isaiah xxvi. 12. "Lord, wilt thou ordain peace for us?" Psalm viii. 2. "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength." Psalm viii. 3. "The moon and the stars which thou hast ordained." Psalm cxxxii. 17. "I have ordained a lamp for mine Anointed," Acts xiii. 48. "As many as were ordained to eternal life, believed." Acts xvi. 4. "The decrees that were ordained of the Apostles and Elders." Romans vii. 10. "The commandment which was ordained to life." Galatians iii. 19. "The law was ordained by angels." 1 Tim. ii. 7. "Good works, which God hath before ordained." Jude 4. "Ungodly men, who were of old ordained to this condemnation."

In all the foregoing passages (and similar ones might be multiplied almost *ad infinitum*) it is manifest to the intellect of a child, that to interpret *ordain* so as to include the laying on of hands, would make sad havoc alike of scripture and of common sense.

Let us now examine a few passages where *ordained* is used with reference to official appointment, and see whether even then it includes imposition of hands:—

Mark iii. 14. "And he ordained twelve, that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach," &c.

Luke records the same transaction thus: "And when it was day he called unto him his disciples; and of them he chose twelve, whom he also named Apostles." Luke vi. 13.

Thus we see that the bare choice of the twelve in this instance constituted their ordination.

Acts i. 22. "Of these, must one be ordained to be a witness with us of his resurrection." Peter is here speaking of the ordination of Matthias; and every body knows that he was ordained not by the laying on of hands, but by the casting of lots.

Acts x. 42. In this passage Jesus is said to have been "ordained of God to be the Judge of the quick and the dead"—not, certainly, by the laying on of God's hands.

Romans xii. 1. "The powers that be are ordained of God." Did he lay his hands on the civil officers when he thus ordained them?

1 Tim. ii. 7. "Whereunto I am ordained a preacher and an Apostle." That Paul was neither ordained a preacher nor an Apostle by the laying on of human hands, was proved in the former essay, both by the record of his conversion and by the express testimony of Paul himself in the first chapter of his letter to the Galatians.

Titus i. 5. "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain Elders in every city, as I had appointed thee."

The word used here in the original is *kataeteses*, from *kathistemi*, which denotes simply to *constitute* or *appoint*—no matter in what manner that appointment may be made. If Titus, as Paul's agent, had done no more than tell the Cretans what were the necessary qualifications of Elders, and they had elected such in any way, every thing would have been done that is implied in this passage, so far as the import of the terms are concerned. And we are not to learn our duty from what scripture *does not say*, but from what it *does say*.

Acts xiv. 23. represents Paul and Barnabas, in their tour through Asia Minor, as having "ordained Elders in every church."

The word used in the original is *cheirotoneo*, which means primarily to extend, or lift up the hand, but commonly to elect in that way. It is also used in a still more general sense to denote appointment to office, without any reference to the manner in which it is made. Thus in 2 Cor. viii. 19., Titus is said to have been chosen (*cheirotonetheis*) by the churches of Macedonia to carry their contribution to the poor saints. There is no proof that hands were laid on him for that purpose. The supposition of such a thing would be highly unreasonable. A compound of this same verb is used in Acts x. 41., (and translatad "chosen before") to express God's choice of the Apostles to be witnesses of the resurrection of Christ. The laying on of hands is obviously excluded here by the necessity of the case.

There is, then, no evidence, nor even intimation, that the persons spoken of as ordained in Acts xiv. 23., had any hands laid on them, but rather presumptive evidence to the contrary; since a phraseology very different from that, which is used on this occasion, is employed invariably to express the laying on of hands.

Dr. Doddridge, although an advocate for Presbyterial ordination by the laying on of hands, paraphrases the foregoing passage thus: "And when they had, by the concurrent suffrages of the people," (he might with more propriety have said *disciples*,) constituted presbyters for them in every city."

In the primitive churches, before the New Testament was written, nothing could be done but by inspiration, or as inspired men directed. The New Testament stands in the same relation to us, as inspired men stood to them. Hence, Paul ordains Elders as truly in our congregations as he did in theirs, when the congregations themselves ordain—that is, simply elect (*cheirotoneo*) or appoint them to office in accordance with his instructions. Any other view subverts the independence of the churches, and the right of each to govern itself according to the scriptures.

To sum up what has been proved in this essay:—1st. *Ordain* means simply appoint, and should have been so rendered. 2d. In most cases where it is used in the common version, the laying on of hands is manifestly excluded. 3d. In none of the cases that have been examined (and I have omitted no official case in the New Testament that I could find) is the laying on of hands ever included.

I would not be understood to say, that the laying on of hands never accompanied appointment to office in the New Testament. What I meant to say is, that imposition of hands is not included in the terms *ordain* and *ordination*, and that where they occur in the common version there is not the slightest evidence that the appointment was ever made by the laying on of hands. So far from it, that as we have seen in all the foregoing cases, there is presumptive evidence, and in one of them positive evidence against the practice.

Your fellow-servant in the gospel, JAMES SHANNON.

College of Louisiana, *Jackson*, April 29, 1839.

REMARKS UPON THE ABOVE.

Respected brother Shannon,

Attending, *pro tem.*, to my son's editorial business for a few weeks in his absence, I take the liberty to offer a few remarks upon your two

essays respecting ministerial ordination, now republished in the Millennial Harbinger according to your request. I may add, that I am the rather encouraged so to do, seeing you express a desire, that we should "point out wherein, if in any thing, at all, they do not accord with the holy scriptures." However this may be, I must say, in the mean time, that son Alexander clearly and fully expresses my views of church order, in his late publication called "*The Christian System*," page 85, sections 14 and 15; which read as follows:—

"While the Christian system allows every man 'as he has received a gift to minister as a good steward of the manifold grace of God,' it makes provision for choosing and setting apart qualified persons for all its peculiar services, necessary to its own edification and comfort, as well as to its usefulness in the world. It provides for its own perpetuity and its growth in the wisest and most practical manner. Its whole wisdom consists in four points:—1st. It establishes the necessary offices for its perpetuity and growth. 2d. It selects the best qualified persons for those offices. 3d. It consecrates or sets those persons apart to those offices. 4th. It commands them to give themselves wholly to the work, that their improvement may keep pace with the growth of the body, and be apparent to all. Can any person point out an imperfection in this plan?

"All its officers, whether for its services at home or abroad, when fully proved, are to be formally and solemnly set apart by the imposition of the hands of the presbytery or eldership of the church. The whole community chooses: the seniors ordain. *This is the apostolic tradition.* Let those unacquainted with the volume examine the apostolic law and usage, Acts vi. 2–6. So the Christian system in its elections and ordinations began. *It is immutable* Therefore this system obtains in all cases."

Now if all this be scripturally right, as I believe it is, it would appear that there is, at least, a shade of difference between this view of the matter and some of the sentiments expressed in the essays under consideration. The first of which comes to this conclusion;—That "there is, in short, *not a single passage* in the New Testament, which records the fact, that any disciple ever had hands laid on him to authorize him to preach the gospel and baptize believers." And "that if *no such limitation* of the commission is expressly taught, no such limitation could have been intended."—That "to proclaim the good news for the salvation of sinners is so manifestly *a moral duty*, as to need no positive statute to make it obligatory on all the disciples." And the second essay comes to this conclusion: 1st. That "*ordain* means simply appoint; and should have been so rendered." 2d. That "in most cases where it is used in the common version the laying on of hands is manifestly excluded." 3d. That "in none of the cases that have been examined, (and I have omitted no official case in the New Testament that I could find,) is the laying on of hands

ever included." Yet you tell us, you would "*not* be understood to say, that the laying on of hands never accompanied appointment to office in the New Testament;" but only, that you "meant to say, that imposition of hands is not included in the terms *ordain* and *ordination*; and, that where they occur in the common version, there is not the slightest evidence that the appointment was ever made by the laying on of hands."

Well, all this being true, still leaves the matter open to investigation: for the question is not about the propriety of the translation, nor yet whether the laying on of hands be found in connexion with the word "ordain," when used in the common version with respect to official appointments; but only whether evangelists, bishops, and deacons were not ordinarily so appointed. We say *ordinarily;* that is, according to the settled order of the apostolic churches. We know there must be churches, before there can be any church order; and also, that whatever the Apostles practised or ordered for accomplishing the object of their mission, before any churches were formed, or where there were none, was perfectly just and right. To return, to the question at issue—that is, Were not Evangelists, Bishops, and Deacons ordinarily appointed by the imposition of hands, with fasting and prayer? We say, Yes, in so far as the churches were immediately concerned in their ordination: that is, when they either received or sent them. It is true, they could only send forth evangelists, not bishops and deacons; for these always bore a special official relation *only* to the churches wherein they were appointed.

Now for the proof. See Acts vi. 6. for the first appointment of deacons; and Acts xiv. 23. for the first recorded ordination of Elders or Bishops. But here there is no mention made of the imposition of hands, but only of an election by suffrage, with the stretching forth of hands;—*cheirotonesantes;*—accompanied with fasting and prayer. And what then? The very persons that did this business, were set apart for it by the imposition of hands, with fasting and prayer, by the church of Antioch, whence they were sent. But to this it is objected, that "the church at Antioch, as a church, had nothing to do with the transaction, so far as the record gives us any information. It was not an act of the body, but of inspired men—'certain prophets and teachers'—appertaining to the body." Well, certainly in every organized body, the official members transact the special business for which they are set apart in the body. Consequently, when there are prophets and teachers in any church, it behooves them to take the lead in the public social exercises in the church to which they belong. Nor, indeed, do we ever find any, in the New Testament, taking the lead in the public

social exercises of the churches, either in praying or teaching, but official characters; namely, Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, and Teachers. These are the divinely appointed agents and organs of the church, by which its public official business of teaching and ruling is to be performed. Wherefore, any business presented to the church in its collective capacity, must be first or immediately presented to its pastors and teachers, and by and through them to the church. Accordingly we find, Acts xiii. 1–3., that "there were in the church which was at Antioch, certain pastors and teachers:" that "as they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Spirit said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." So much for their mission by and from the church of Antioch; which, when they had accomplished by preaching the gospel first in the Isle of Cyprus, and afterwards in the cities of Perga in Pamphylia, Antioch in Pisidia, and in Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, cities of Lycaonia, and had converted many, and ordained them elders in every church, with prayer and fasting, they returned "to Antioch, from whence they had been recommended to the grace of God, for the work which they fulfilled. And when they were come, and had gathered the church together, they rehearsed all that God had done by them; and how he had opened the door of faith to the Gentiles. And there they abode a long time with the disciples." Thus begun and ended the first church mission to the Gentiles.

But still it is objected to the ordination under our immediate consideration, Acts xiv. 23., that there is no mention made of the laying on of hands. True, but what does that prove? That because the imposition of hands is not mentioned, as well as fasting and prayer, therefore it was not practised upon that occasion? As well might it be argued, that none of the converts made during this mission were baptized; because Paul, in his first sermon, recorded upon this occasion, delivered in the synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia, concludes without mention of baptism, saying, "Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which you could not be justified by the law of Moses."—And because it is not so much as once mentioned in the records of the whole of this very successful tour. But if the laying on of hands, with prayer and fasting, be not the divinely appointed manner of setting apart certain persons to special stated offices in the church, why do we find it used in the first appointment of deacons, Acts vi. 6.? Or why the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, 1 Tim. iv. 14.? Or

why the caution to Timothy to lay hands suddenly on no man? And if all the dirciples be bound by a moral necessity to preach and baptize, why all the special directions given to Timothy and Titus about choosing and ordaining fit persons for teaching and ruling in the churches?—"faithful men, that should be able to teach others"—men of character and standing, "having a good report of them that are without"—"not novices, lest being lifted up with pride, they should fall into the condemnation of the devil"? &c. &c. Why all this ado about electing and ordaining duly qualified persons, if every disciple, as such, be a preacher, a teacher, a baptist, by a moral necessity? But we know, that the whole body is neither eye, nor ear, nor tongue; and that all the members have not the same office: see Rom. xii. 4.

The objection in your first essay, against the application of 1 Tim. iv. 14. to an official ordination, because it is said to have conferred a special gift, appears quite irrelevant; for surely, the putting of one in possession of an honorable office may be justly styled a gift or favor. Besides, it appears that Timothy received the gift of the Spirit by the laying on of Paul's hands; see 2 Tim. i. 6. Now that the laying on of Paul's hands had an immediate respect to his reception of the Holy Spirit is evident, not only from the uniform intention and effect of the Apostles' hands upon baptized believers, as such: see Acts viii. 14—17.; but also, from the immediate contextual connexion in which we find it, 1 Tim. i. 6–18. and ii. 1–7. The whole of which taken together, is to excite Timothy to courage and constancy in the endurance of all manner of hardships in the persevering and faithful discharge of all the duties of his office. Indeed, this is evidently the proper and primary intention of this epistle, which was written by the Apostle in confinement, under that most ruthless tyrant Nero, and in the near prospect of an ignominious death. Wherefore he commences with such considerations, as would have the most direct and powerful tendency to inspire Timothy with fortitude, for the faithful discharge of all his official duties in the face of all opposition; putting him in mind of the special advantages he enjoyed from his pious parents; and from his early acquaintance with the Apostle himself; who salutes him as a "dearly beloved son"—as his "own son in the faith:" reminding him of the special favor he had received at his hands;—of that gift of God which he thus enjoyed; even "the spirit of power, and of love, and of a sound mind." But, in the fourth chapter of the preceding epistle, where the Apostle speaks of the laying on of the hands of the presbytery, he has evidently a direct and immediate respect to the constant, diligent, and faithful performance of all his official duties respectively: and not to the miraculous gift of the Holy Spirit, which he received by

the imposition of the Apostle's hands; saying, ver. 13–16., "Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them; that thy profiting may appear to all. Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine; continue in them: for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee." Thus was Timothy excited to the due and faithful discharge of all his official duties; one of which was, as we learn from the 22d verse of the 5th chapter, to "lay hands suddenly on no man," that he might not be a partaker of other men's sins, by ordaining unqualified persons, contrary to the directions contained in the 3d chapter; and thus, by countenancing such, become a partaker of their evil deeds. 2 John v. 11. And that it was one of the official duties of evangelists to ordain bishops and deacons, the following scriptures taken together demonstrably prove. See 1 Tim. iii. 14, 15., and v. 22., with 2 Tim. ii. 2., and Titus i. 5–9. "These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly: but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth."—"Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be a partaker of other men's sins: keep thyself pure."—"And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also."—"For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city as I had appointed thee: if any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot, or unruly. For a bishop must be blameless, as the steward of God; not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre; but a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate; holding fast the faithful word, as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers."

Upon the whole, for what other purpose could the imposition of the hands of evangelists and presbyters, mentioned in 1 Tim. iv. 14., and v. 22., be intended, if not for the purpose of ordination to some special official business, to the performance of which the persons were not previously bound, by the common ties of moral obligation? For the communication of spiritual gifts by the imposition of hands, that is, conferring miraculous powers,—(not simply the working of miracles,)—was peculiar to the Apostles. And even in the cases of official ordination, in which the Apostles were concerned, recorded Acts vi.

6., and xiii. 3., there was no communication of spiritual gifts; for both the ordainers and the ordained were previously filled with the Holy Spirit. For what purpose, then, were the ordained thus set apart? We answer, For a peculiar business—for a special work—to which, in neither case, the ordained were previously bound by the common ties of moral obligation: see Acts vi. 3., and xiv. 26.—the former of which reads thus: "Brethren, look ye out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Spirit and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business." The latter thus: "And thence they sailed to Antioch, from whence they had been recommended to the grace of God, for the *work* which they fulfilled." Hence it is evident, that in both cases, the appointment was purely for official purposes.

Respected brother, yours very respectfully,

THOMAS CAMPBELL.

PASSIVE OBEDIENCE AND NON-RESISTANCE.

JAMESTOWN, OHIO, 15th October, 1839.

Brother Campbell—HAVE patience with me until I make this third communication.

We have some honest-hearted well-meaning men amongst us, who are able to teach others also; who have found doctrines in the scriptures, or think they have found doctrines, which prohibit Christians from taking any part in politics. According to these doctrines a Christian must not hold any office in the political government, nor must he vote for any officer in said government.

These men agree that Christians ought to be subject to "the powers that be;" that they ought to obey kings, magistrates, &c. But they divide obedience into *active* and *passive*, and then assume that the obedience required of Christians is *passive*. Or, to bring the subject before you in plain English, *passive obedience* means *to suffer the penalty of disobedience*—i. e. the Christian is commanded to muster or march in the army, he disobeys the command, but pays the fine imposed on him for disobedience. This is what is called *passive obedience*.

Does any man, who is destitute of *ism*, believe for a moment that the obedience enjoined by Peter and Paul on all Christians, was of the above mentioned kind? Was it the *obedience of disobedience* that they enjoined on Christians when they commanded them to obey kings, &c?

But these men feel very strong, and are desirous to discuss this subject publicly. They think it of great importance, and are as much gratified when they make a proselyte, as if they had made a proselyte to the Christian religion. But the worst is not told: They think that this notion is a part and parcel of the gospel, and that it is essential to salvation. This doctrine, when carried out, makes salvation to depend on being separated from all political governments. They must neither vote nor be voted for, else they are not Christians.

Do you think there could be a new sect reared on this foundation? I verily believe there can, and think probably there will.

This new doctrine is called the doctrine of "*non-resistance*," and is supposed to be fully taught in the Lord's Sermon on the Mount.

May the Lord preserve the church from error of every kind!

Affectionately yours,

M. WINANS.

REPLY TO M. WINANS.

Beloved brother Winans—THE doctrine of passive obedience, or non-resistance, as you define it to be understood by some, is certainly unscriptural, being neither taught in the Old nor New Testament; though the doctrine of private anger, spite, and revenge; of retaliation of evil for evil; and even of personal self-defence when persecuted for righteousness' sake, are strictly forbidden in both: see Lev. xix. 18. "Thou shalt not avenge, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people; but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Prov. xvi. 32. "He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty; and he that ruleth his spirit, than he that taketh a city." xx. 12. "Say not thou, I will render to the man according to his work." xxv. 21, 22.. "If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; and if he thirsty, give him drink; for thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head, and the Lord shall reward thee." Matth. v. 30, 41, 44, 45. "I say unto you, that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain. Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven." Acts vi. 59, 60. "And they stoned Stephen, calling upon the Lord, and saying,—Lord, lay not this sin to their charge." Rom. xii. 17, 19–21. "Recompense to no man evil for evil.—Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves; but rather give place unto wrath: for it is written, Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord. Therefore, if thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink: for in so doing thou shall heap coals of fire on his head. Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."—So much for passive obedience and non-resistance:—for doing good for evil; with the perfect accordance of both Testaments. And all this without any interference with our political duties; as the subjects of civil government. For he that said, "Resist not evil;" also said, (Matth. xxii. 21.,) "Render to Cesar the things that are Cesar's." And by his Apostles, Peter and Paul, he has given us the most solemn charges to honor kings, to obey magistrates, to be

ready to every good work. See Romans xiii. 1–7.; Titus iii. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 13–17. Wherefore there can be no inconsistency between the two lines of duty, so distinctly marked out in the above quotations. The former manifestly respecting our private personal duties to our fellow-creatures, so and so conducting themselves towards us, and our political duties in relation to civil society. In the mean time, however, our civil obligations do not bind us to do any thing that the Lord has forbid us to do. For while we are to render to Cesar the things that are Cesar's, we must also render to God the things that are God's.

Respected brother, yours very affectionately,

THOMAS CAMPBELL.

THE GOSPEL—*No. VI.*

"Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the GOSPEL which I preached unto you, which also you have received, and wherein ye stand: by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, *how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures.*" 1 COR. xv. 1—4.

THE annunciation of the gospel facts, as intimated in our last, naturally suggests inquiry respecting the person who is therein declared to have been "delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification." This inquiry, as we endeavored to show, leads at once to a knowledge of Christ as the Son of the Blessed, and to an acquaintance with God as the creator, proprietor, and governor of the world. The intimate and immediate relation, then, which these simple facts bear to the whole of divine revelation will be at once perceived, when the reader is reminded that the great and leading object of the entire Old Testament is to exhibit the character of God the Father; and that in the New Testament, while the four Evangelists have for their express object to show that Christ Jesus is the Son of God; the Acts of Apostles expound and illustrate the doctrine that he died for the sins of the world—for Jews and Gentiles; and the epistolary writings with the Apocalypse have for their prominent and engrossing theme, the resurrection of Christ as the first fruits of the dead, upon which the exhortations to purity of heart, perseverance in well doing; to faith, hope, love, virtue, joy, are almost uniformly founded. Thus the three facts which constitute the gospel, like the three principal notes* in music

* Tonic, dominant, and subdominant.

from which all melody is derived. give birth to all divine revelations which, but for them, would have neither charm nor meaning to the ears of ruined man.

Atonement or expiation; death on account of sin; deliverance of the guilty from death by the death of a victim, have formed the subject matters of the faith and of the typical and commemorative institutions of all the religions of the Bible. Each had its altar, its sacrifice, its priest; nor did the accepted offering of the righteous Abel express aught else than did the sacrificial or paschal lamb of the Mosaic economy, or than does now the communion of the body and blood of Christ —our passover, who was sacrificed for us. These various types and emblems are but the same letters taken from a different case: they have always expressed the same radical ideas; so that as there is but one language in heaven, there has ever been but one among the saints on earth.

Thus it is that the institutions of the gospel have a direct and immediate relation to its facts. The breaking of the loaf and the pouring out of the wine in the Lord's supper are commemorative and descriptive of the fact that Christ was "bruised for our iniquities," and that his blood was shed for the remission of our sins. The Lord's day indicates the time at which he rose from the dead, and the ordinance of immersion not only presents to view in a figure his death, burial, and resurrection, but is made also to the penitent believer the assurance of pardon and of an interest in his salvation, who, as does the believer, in dying, died to sin once, but in living, lives to God. Hence, as says the scripture, "He that believeth [the gospel] and is baptized shall be saved." So that, by this beautiful adaptation, the institutions of the gospel both communicate its blessings, and perpetuate the remembrance of those wonderful events from which these blessings flow.

The great matters of faith, hope, and love,—the vocabulary and the primary institutions of religion—have, then, in reality, always been the same. Sacrifice, the shedding of blood, the forgiveness of sin, and fellowship with God, were every thing in the beginning, and to them nothing can be added now. Religion has remained as unchangeable as its Author or its subject. It is a remedial system, and as the malady (sin) has ever been the same, the means of cure have remained unaltered. Grateful homage to God, and conformity to the divine character, displaying itself in personal holiness, and good offices to men—piety and morality in brief, constitute its unvarying definition in all ages, and under every dispensation. And all this springs immediately from assurances of the love and goodness of God, as stated in the gospel facts, to wit, that he gave his Son to be the propitiation for the sins of

the world—and the deliverer of the human race from death; facts which have been held up to view in the sacrifices and oblations of the righteous in every period of the world. All through these, like Abel, obtained witness of their justification, God testifying of their gifts; all, like Enoch, rejoiced to walk with God; all, like ancient Israel, partook of the same spiritual food, drank of the same spiritual rock, and looked forward with earnest expectation to the same heavenly inheritance.

If, then, the gospel facts contain fully and substantially every thing shadowed forth in all the religious observances of former dispensations, and are now simply held in perpetual remembrance by all the ordinances of Christianity: if they present a complete display of that love of God from which all religion springs; and, together with the vocabulary of salvation, furnish the realities of all faith, and hope, and love, it follows that, however few and simple they may be, they are perfectly adapted to the wants and circumstances of the human family; or, to adopt the language of our motto, that 'by these we are saved if we keep them in remembrance.'

In the first of them, the title under which our Lord is presented opens to view the most intimate and extensive relations. He is styled Christ—the Christ—the Anointed. By a reference to the types and prophecies of the Old Testament we find this to be an official designation, and that he sustains the three several offices of prophet, priest, and king, anointed and consecrated by divine authority. When we consider him in these official relations, in connexion with his lofty descent, and his own transcendant character, we at once perceive how perfectly he is fitted to accomplish our deliverance. As a prophet or teacher, who was ever so meek and condescending; so accessible to the poor and heavy-laden? What teacher ever delivered instructions so pure and heavenly; so novel and interesting; wisdom so deep in language so simple; or truths so various and comprehensive in terms so brief? And who was so well qualified to reveal to earth the things of heaven, as he who came from heaven; who was 'with God from everlasting before his works of old?' What high priest could mediate like the Son of God, or who as likely to be heard as he? In whose power was it to make an offering so precious, so perfect, so declarative of the divine justice, so illustrative of the heinous nature of sin, and so confirmatory of the love of God for men, as the sacrifice of Christ? Or what earthly monarch was equal like him to universal dominion; competent to give laws infallibly just; to protect the innocent and punish the guilty; to redeem his people even from death: to ransom them from the power of the grave, and make them partakers of the

riches and honors, the glory and immortality of which he is himself possessed?

But again: It is stated in the first fact that this illustrious person "died for our sins according to the [ancient] scriptures." This, once admitted, and the immediate and natural conclusion is, that it is now in our power to escape from sin; and if from sin, by necessary implication, from all its consequences. This is Paul's argument in Heb. ix. and x., where he shows that a plenary remission; a perfect deliverance; an eternal redemption necessarily result from such a sacrifice offered by the high priest of the greater and more perfect tabernacle. Were we to analyze the reasonings and trace to their premises all the positions and conclusions of the Apostles, we should find them to be in like manner *inductions* from the simple facts which constitute the gospel. It is, indeed, their constant habit to reason from these facts, of which they were witnesses; which had been impressed upon their minds with so much force, and which they were commanded to proclaim to every creature. How bold and sweeping, yet how just and logical are their conclusions! "We thus judge," says Paul, "that if one died for all, then were all dead: and that he died for all that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them and rose again." We have here the whole ground of Christian obligations and duties covered by one single induction legitimately drawn from the first fact of the gospel. Again, he says in another place, "He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him freely give us all things?" How glorious a consequence! Yet how just and natural a conclusion that God, after bestowing the most precious gift in the universe, would not withhold any thing of inferior value. Encouraged by this obvious induction from the fact in question, the believer may confidently expect the divine presence and protection, the communion of that Holy Spirit of promise, the earnest of his inheritance, the joys, the riches, and the honors of heaven. Sometimes, indeed, the connexion between the fact and the inference is less obvious. Nevertheless it always exists. We have an instance of this in what Paul says to the Athenians. "God," says he, "has appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given an assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead." There are two inductions here from the fact of Christ's resurrection; to wit, that God had appointed a day of judgment, and that he has chosen Christ as judge. The dependence of these conclusions upon the premises may not be at first apparent; but upon a moment's reflection it will be seen that to admit the fact of the

resurrection, carries the mind at once into another world—into the midst of another scene, in which man is to conclude his part so obviously imperfect here, and imperfect too from the very want of a day of judgment—an equitable distribution of rewards and punishments. It grants at once a connexion between the world of matter and the world of spirit, and supposes a fixed and determinate plan, and train of events to be brought to a close upon a certain day. And as all intelligent beings are with evident propriety judged by one who is possessed of the same nature, and the administration of rewards and punishments constitute the most honorable and responsible office which any one could possibly sustain, the conclusion would be perfectly natural, that the man who was first in honor, as evinced by his resurrection from the dead, had been already chosen to this office. Our Lord thus speaks of himself, John v. "As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will: for the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, that all men should honor the Son," &c. Again, "As the Father has life in himself, so has he given to the Son to have life in himself [to rise from the dead,] and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of Man."

Further—It is declared in the last fact of the gospel, that Christ "rose the third day according to the scriptures." Here the resurrection of all men is an obvious deduction. There is nothing in man which renders it necessary that he should die. It is to him a strange and unexpected phenomenon. He does not die from necessity, but from appointment. "It is appointed unto all men once to die." Our experience teaches us that such is the appointment of God. When, therefore, we witness the death of a fellow-mortal, we infer at once the divine appointment, and our own impending fate as participants of the same nature, and obnoxious to the same penalty. All grant this to be a proper and lawful induction from the fact. The converse, then, will be equally just, and the resurrection of a man will be as certain an evidence that all will rise—that it is equally a divine appointment that after death there shall be a resurrection to judgment.—Thus again Paul reasons from the resurrection of Christ; that as death came by a man, so does the resurrection also; and that all shall rise in their proper order, "Christ the first fruits," &c. It may be objected here that as we have many facts or cases to prove mortality, and but one in proof of immortality, the evidence for the latter is insufficient But this objection will not hold; for the time is not yet arrived at which we might expect more cases, and the one we have is given to

us, as it were, before the time, for the express purpose of being to us a proof of what should follow at the appointed season—to give us an exemplification of all the conditions or stages in human destiny. From the ripening of a single ear of wheat before the harvest, we should most certainly, by induction, infer the ripening of the rest. Thus life and immortality have been brought to light by the gospel.

But it is not my present purpose to trace out the consequences resulting from the gospel facts. This were to transcribe the greater part of the New Testament. I wish here only to show how extensive these are, and how naturally they arise from these facts so few and simple. I will only add, that however various the conclusions drawn from the same facts by different Apostles, they never clash with each other. Paul may admire the wisdom of God therein displayed, and show its wonderful results; Peter may rejoice in his faithfulness; while John is impressed with the conclusion that God is love, inferring that if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another. Yet all their deductions are in harmony; and, like the rays of light issuing from the sun, which are concentric, but distinct; and converging, however widely diffused: these are separate, though proceeding from a common centre, and are traced to this, however remote they may appear.

He, then, who believes the gospel, believes the Bible; believes every thing necessary to salvation; every thing which can or ever did rejoice, redeem, or exalt one of Adam's race. What can be added to the gospel? What more can be desired by man, sinful and mortal, than to be delivered from sin and to be blessed with immortality? And how perfectly suited, then, the gospel of Christ to the wants and circumstances of the human family!

How great is the wisdom displayed by our heavenly Father, in thus basing religion upon facts rather than upon theory or authority! How great has been the folly of men in reversing this procedure! Facts may be proved by witnesses, and the inductions from them being inevitable, absolute certainty is the result. But theories depend upon the vanity of human reason, and are as uncertain and fallible as the source from which they spring. It is, then, most desirable that men should abandon a course which has proved so fatal to the peace, unity, and prosperity of Christendom, and unite together in the belief of the facts of the gospel; and in the participation of those privileges; the practice of those precepts and the enjoyment of those lofty and exhilarating hopes which immediately and necessarily result from them.

R. R.

SIN—*A DIALOGUE.*

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 446—AND CONCLUDED.]

Eugenio. How cheering is the conviction that all the ills of life; the terrible consequences of sin; the pains and penalties of disobedience; the machinations of the Adversary at once of God and man, are controlled, overruled, and counteracted by One who is so infinite in his resources of power, wisdom, and goodness! He provides a balm for every wound; a cordial for every fear; an antidote for every grief; and makes even sin itself, as you have shown, the occasion of new displays of beauty and new developments of the divine and human nature. Thus the dark shades of evening which seem as though they would cover with their dusky veil the fair face of nature and hide it from our sight, serve only to present to us in the glories of the spangled heavens, and the enchantment of the moon's silvery radiance, a view of the universe more accurate, extensive, and magnificent than we could ever have obtained by day.

Philander. In this age the divine purposes are so far revealed, that we may justly regard the history of the world as a great drama in which there is a manifest unity of design, to wit, the development of the human nature, and its assimilation to that of God. The earth, then, becomes the STAGE. The *dramatis personæ* are God, and Satan; angels and demons; good men and wicked men. In the PLOT, Satan seeks to destroy men: in the COUNTERPLOT, God determines to save them, and to secure the ultimate triumph of virtuous and noble principles. It is the combat of light with darkness; truth with error; good with evil—the contest of Orosmades and Arimanius.

This great drama is divided into its different acts. The first embraces that period during which the divine economy extends to the whole human family, which lasts 2000 years, and ends at the call of Abraham, In the second, which also takes in 2000 years, and closes with the Jewish age and the coming of Messiah the Prince, the family of Abraham are the chief actors upon the stage. In the third, which has now (A. D. 1839) reached almost to the same period of 2000 years, the whole world again appears under the designation of Jews and Gentiles. The fourth or last act embraces the millennial age spoken of in the Prophets, in which the plot thickens; a rapid succession of events interprets the divine purposes, and a denoument takes place, in which virtue is gloriously triumphant, and vice as signally overcome.

These acts again have each their different scenes. The first scene of the first act opens with the beautiful picture of Eden, innocence,

and love; and presents in the trees which are in the midst of the garden, and in the laws and elementary arrangements, the groundwork, and symbolic indications of all that is to follow. In the second we have the temptation, and the curtain falls when man guilty, condemned, and disinherited, 'from Eden takes his solitary way.' The third includes the death of Abel and the birth of Seth, a type of Christ, and the progenitor of that branch which remained faithful to God. The fourth shows the increasing knowledge and wickedness of the human race, which become at length almost extinct in the flood of Noah. The fifth brings us to the confusion of tongues. But I need not particularize the various interesting scenes through which the human family has passed; or dwell upon the incidents which prefigured and prepared for the appearance of "the seed of the woman;" "Immanuel the virgin's son;" the second Adam, the mighty conqueror who come to deliver man from one who was too puissant in power, subtlety, and malignity for weak and unaided humanity. In all these you will at once anticipate me, and perceive the gradual evolution of the plot, and the deeper wisdom of the counter-plot by which every attempt of Satan to destroy and humble the human race is made to promote their salvation and exaltation.

Eugenio. The figure under which you regard the movements and transactions appertaining to human destiny, serves indeed to give point and force to the whole eventful history of man; and like the golden thread which unites the pearls of the necklace, to generalize and connect the precious revelations of sacred scripture. How deeply interesting are the records of truth! No romance, however wild and imaginative; no histrionic composition, however ingenious and affecting, penned by man, ever introduced characters so lofty; incidents so marvellous, or results so unexpected and so grand.

Philander. And what gives power and interest to the whole is this, that every thing here is reality and truth, and that every human being is of necessity a party in the affair and a partaker in its dread results. In the midst, then, of such a contest, where victory or death are the only alternatives—a deadly struggle not with flesh and blood, but with spiritual powers of superior strength, it is, as you before remarked, most cheering to be assured of the aid of one who is ever ready to hasten to our succor, and ever able to change an apparent defeat into a glorious victory.

This, indeed, is a striking feature in the history of the human family, and seems to constitute what might be termed the artful mechanism of the drama. It is doubtless necessary, constituted as we are, to a proper apprehension of character. Hence the poet has recourse to it,

and allows his hero to be reduced to the lowest straits, and plunged into difficulties which appear to us insurmountable. But at the very moment when we are ready to give up all for lost, he suddenly by some skillful stroke of policy, or some unlooked-for hazardous and dazzling exploit, changes the whole face of affairs, and achieves a triumph. We are by this means enabled to appreciate his character and the extent of his resources. It is precisely so in the divine procedure.

Thus when Satan had seduced our first parents and rendered them obnoxious to the penalty of death, he seemed to have succeeded to his wish. Little did he think that he had laid the foundation of his own overthrow, and of the future exaltation of those whom he sought to destroy, in that very death of which he was the occasion. But superior wisdom contrived a plan for the destruction, through death, of him that was thus permitted to have the power of bringing death upon our race, and for the glorious deliverance of those whom he thus subjected to bondage. And all this doubtless to the surprize and discomfiture of the enemy, was set forth in striking symbols at the time of the transaction,—a transaction by which the Creator took occasion not only thus to display superior wisdom, but also to manifest justice and mercy in harmonious and sacred union with each other.

To how low an ebb were the fortunes of mankind reduced at a subsequent period, when Satan had again led the world into wickedness and crime; so that out of the innumerable multitudes which now filled the earth, but one was found faithful to God! Or when upon a shoreless ocean a frail bark of gopher-wood bore above the unfathomed abyss the hope of the human race and of all the animated terrestrial tribes! But

> —"Overhead a rainbow bursting through
> The scattering clouds, shone, spanning the dark sea,
> Resting its bright hues on the quivering blue;
> And all within its arch appeared to be
> Clearer than that without, and its wide hue
> Wax'd broad and waving like a banner free,
> Then changed to a bow that's bent—
> ——— A heavenly chameleon,
> The airy child of vapor and the sun,
> Brought forth in purple, cradled in vermillion,
> Baptized in molten gold and swathed in dun
> Glittering like crescents o'er a Turk's pavillion,
> And blending every color into one."

It shone—the glad token of peace and security; a type of future joys; a smile amidst the first tears of heaven, and another scene opens in which man commences a new career under happier auspices.

It is, however, needless to adduce other examples from the ancient records; or to pursue either the whole human family, or Abraham and his posterity through all their vicissitudes of fortune, and their deliverances in the hour of extreme peril. We have in the history of our Lord familiar and striking illustrations; when at one period man had no hope of aid or rescue except what should be given by an infant whose only cradle was the manger of a stable in the least of the cantons of Judah; when the midnight hour witnessed his hasty flight from the sanguinary Herod; or when after a life of humiliation and suffering, delivered into the hands of the enemy, he yielded up his pure spirit upon the cross. Yet in all he triumphed; and descending into the lowest depths, he from thence arose leading captivity captive, and bringing up from the dark and dreary mansions of the dead, life and immortality. There could be no greater extremity; no loftier triumph; and no overthrow of the Prince of Darkness by his own devices more signal and complete.

Eugenio. It is, indeed, overwhelming to consider the infinite power, wisdom, and philanthropy of God, displayed in the singular and oft-repeated deliverances vouchsafed to men, at the very moment when Satan seemed to have acquired uncontrollable dominion. And the extremities to which sin has at times reduced our race, have not only thus called forth these manifestations of the divine character, but have also served to show the real designs of Satan, and the true nature and tendency of sin. We clearly perceive thereby that sin aims at nothing less than a total subversion of the divine government; that its natural tendency is to fill the earth with violence; and not only to despoil man of every thing which could happify and exalt him, but to plunge him into the lowest depths of misery and degradation.

Philander. True; and it is above all in the sufferings and death of Christ, by which we most clearly perceive the love of God, that we see also most evidently the cruel malignity and appalling effects of sin. It is here evinced that it rages with unappeasable animosity against all that is lovely, pure, and noble; and that its fury is proportioned to the excellence and perfection of the object against which it directs its assaults. He, then, who would most fully understand its character, must witness it mocking and insulting the meek and lowly; slandering the innocent; oppressing and afflicting him who had none to help; and piercing those hands which were never opened but to bless; those feet, the feet of him who preached the gospel of peace and brought glad tidings of good things; and that heart which beat only with love for men. He must contemplate the awful events of that hour when even a dying malefactor could revile the just; when the sun himself could

no longer look upon a crime so great; and when the very rocks were less obdurate than sinful men. But for these evidences we never could have believed that sin could attain to such malignity, and he knows but little of its power who disbelieves or is ignorant of the death of Jesus Christ.

Oh! how joyful is the hope of being freed from so dire an influence; so dreadful a servitude; so fatal a disease!—of having our souls at length purified from all alloy; the insensibility of unbelief, the madness of passion, and the infatuation of pride: our intellect invigorated and enlightened; and our mortal part clothed with the beauty of an eternal youth! How well prepared we shall be for rest after our toilsome journey through this weary land! How well fitted to appreciate the happiness of that abode where peace, purity, and joy forever reign. Then shall the dominion of Satan exist no more! Circumvented in all his attempts to ruin man, with his auxiliaries death and the grave, he shall be plunged into the flaming abyss. It shall no longer be possible for men to sin! "Neither can they die any more"! Having seen the power, wisdom, and goodness of God displayed on earth, we shall there behold his blessedness. Oh! happy day, when we shall depart from this sin-polluted world to such an audience in the palace of the universe! There too we shall meet with those whom we have loved on earth. There shall we rejoin the oft-remembered tenants of the tombs around us, in whose company every joy shall be enhanced. I shall again see that venerable friend with whom I have so often held sweet converse; who was so devoted to the interests of the cause of truth; so temperate; so just; of uncorrupted integrity and unblemished faith—and the beloved Arthur, so intelligent, yet so humble; so gentle, yet so firm; of taste so refined; of morals so pure; whose acuteness of feeling, and high sense of honor and religious obligation, while they elevated his own character, caused him many a sorrow in his intercourse with others. But he sorrows no more! I myself witnessed his joyful and triumphant departure from this present evil world, to enjoy the fellowship of glorified and congenial spirits. There too I shall behold those amiable ones who suffered persecution and loss for Jesus' sake, whose hearts trembled at the word of the Lord, and whose reward is great in heaven; and that beautiful and youthful band endeared by the most tender associations. The hard and insensible marble here marks their graves; but, ah! for those so bright, so transient, and so fair, a better memento would be the early flowers of spring; the primrose; the snow-drop; the yet unfolded rose-bud—a more suitable emblem, the morning dew which sparkles, is exhaled, and goes to heaven.

But the bell rings for family devotion, and we must return. May we not, in view of all that we considered in regard to sin and the circumstances in which it has involved us, exclaim, in conclusion, with the Apostle, "Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ!" R. R.

CHRISTIANS AMONG THE SECTS—*No. IX.*

I HAVE just received the November number of the Millennial Harbinger, containing a short and piquant letter from W. Winans, upon "Christians among the sects." I had resolved from the first to engage in no controversy on this subject; nor will I now. Indeed there is nothing before me to *controvert*. Furthermore, brother Winans writes his own condemnation in the very first sentence of his letter. He says, "I have *not read* with sufficient attention the essays of Christianos to enable me to point out the *errors*, nor to appreciate the *truths* contained in them." A wise man once said, "He that answers a matter *prin akousa*, (before he understands it,) it is folly, and a reproach unto him." I must say, that I never expected from one of *my own brethren* any thing so *exceedingly uncandid!!* No one of our opponents has ever given a more perfect *caricature* of the "*first principles*" of our holy religion, than my brother Winans has here given of the views of Christianos. If we can thus prejudge and misrepresent each other's views, need we complain, or think it strange if our opponents do so too!! I never made *ignorance* a saviour: so far from it, I have said in a former essay, "The man who remains in *voluntary ignorance* upon any part of *truth* or *duty*, is as really *culpable* as the man who, knowing, remains in wilful disobedience; for he shows the very *state of mind*—(mark the expression)—the very state of mind that would keep him in *disobedience if enlightened.*" I would earnestly request brother Winans to do *me*, and more especially *himself*, the justice to turn and read the second essay of Christianos, titled "SINCERITY."

I do not think that any one will ever be saved by *ignorance;* yet I would as soon expect to be saved by *ignorance* as by *knowledge:* for "knowledge puffeth up"—"if any one thinketh that he knoweth any thing, he knoweth nothing yet as he ought to *know*"—"if any man would become wise in this age, let him become a fool that he may be wise"—yea, "though I could speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and though I had all *knowledge* and understood all mysteries, and have not love, I am as a sounding brass or a noisy cymbal." This, however, is not true of *all* knowledge; for, "this is the *life eternal*, to *know* thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.' But *this* knowledge implies an humble confidence in the Saviour. "They that know thy name, (says David,) will put their trust in thee." It implies also that apprehension of his person and character that will transform us into his image—that will teach us, like him, to have "*compassion* on the ignorant and erring," and not contumeliously reproach them with their ignorance, and boast of our own superior attainments. No man can be a Christian without know-

ledge enough to believe in the Saviour, and to love his character, and adore his person: and this is the *end* and *aim* of Christianity. "The end of the commandment is love out of a pure heart, and a good conscience, and faith unfeigned." "What think you of Christ, is the test." Ignorance here would be fatal: but a man may be a very good Christian, and be very ignorant of the meaning of "the two olive trees"—of "the seven branches of the golden candlestick"—or of "the golden bells and the pomegranates" fastened to the high priest's garment. I also aver that a man may be very ignorant of the true *import* and *action* of baptism—yea, and of all the Christian ordinances, and yet be in character a Christian—an accepted worshipper of God. As has been before shown at *length*, that state of mind that leads a man to exclaim with Saul, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" or to pray with David, "Lord, search me, and know my heart; try me, and know my thoughts, and see if there be any wicked way in me; and lead me in the way everlasting.' That state of mind constitutes any man an acceptable worshipper of the Lord—it fits him "for the bliss of heaven."

Christianos has before appealed to *nature:* to *it* he again appeals. "The God of Nature is the God of Grace. Take the animal life of man, for example, and how *simple* the provision necessary barely to *perpetuate that life!* The savage of the wilderness, subsisting by the chase, dwelling half naked in his hut of the bark of trees, has all that is *necessary* to animal *existence;* but much more would be necessary to the highest *enjoyment* of which his nature was capable. The children of Israel, during their journey in the wilderness, had every thing necessary to their *existence;* but they were not satisfied with the *bare perpetuity of existence:* they wished to *enjoy life!* The dwelling in *tents*, and the feeding upon manna, was not with them the "*vita perpetua;*" for they had the promise of "a land flowing with milk and honey"—"a land of hills and valleys, of rivers and fountains of water; a land of oil olive and honey." They had *lived* in the wilderness; but *here* they were to *enjoy life.*

So in the kingdom of grace, I aver that a man may be spiritually *alive*—yea, that he may form a very perfect Christian *character*, while at the same time he is very far from entering all the *enjoyments* of the Christian *state.* In other words, I affirm that not one of the ordinances is *absolutely essential to spiritual life.* And further, I affirm that they can have *no* connexion with the future life and bliss, only as they tend to the formation of Christian character. But while I affirm this, I also affirm that *all* the ordinances of the gospel are absolutely essential to the full *enjoyment* of the "present salvation." But the ordinances are all "for our sakes"—they are *means*, and not *ends;* for "the *end* of the commandment is *love*"—"he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him." This is the bliss of heaven!—"the fullness of joy!"

I wish to be distinctly understood, and therefore I again request brother Winans to read my second number on *sincerity.* When I am understood, I shall not contend for the *last word.* I loathe controversy! "I am about a *great work*, and I cannot come down," said Nehemiah.

I think my good brother Winans "came down" very far in some things in the letter before me. I sincerely regret to see one of the

"royal priesthood" stoop so low! In the mean time I would *comfort* my *friends* and *warn* my *opposers*, by assuring them that many *tomes* of such "smart things," and such "*sharp* things," will never injure Christianos. He has on a breastplate that will shiver *ten thousand* such lances!!!

In the meantime, brother Winans, give me your hand, and "come up higher;" and let us partake of something better—something more feasting to the soul than these husks and shells of controversy; let us have something more warming to the heart than the moon-beams of disputation. They are as chilling as the icebergs of Greenland!!! We are too rational—too intellectual entirely! The brethren are both *freezing* and *starving* for something sentimental! Let us go up and take our seat with David "the sweet singer of Israel," and listen to the fervent aspirations of his soul! Methinks I hear him exclaim, "As the hart panteth after the water-brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God; for the living God! When shall I come and appear before God!" Lord grant that the spirit of David thy servant may fall upon us!—that we, like him, may thirst for the living God!—that we may ardently desire to appear before Thee! Lord, grant us "the sure mercies of David"! Again "the sweet singer" exclaims, "How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts! My soul longeth; yea, even fainteth for the courts of the Lord: my heart and my flesh cry out for the living God!" "Blessed are they that dwell in thy house: they will be still praising thee. They go from strength to strength, every one appearing in Zion before God." "For a day in thy courts is better than a thousand. I had rather be a door-keeper in the house of my God, than to dwell in the tents of wickedness. For the Lord God is a sun and shield: the Lord will give grace and glory; and no good thing will he withhold from them that walk uprightly. O Lord of hosts, blessed is the man that trusteth in thee." Do you not, brother Winans, say *Amen* to these aspirations? Do you not with me exclaim, Lord save us from the bitter "waters of strife"? Do you not exclaim, Lord give us the *devotion*, the faith, the hope, the zeal of the ancients! If you wish to change the theme, my brother, we will hear David speak of his royal successor, who was to sit upon "the holy hill of Zion:"—"My heart is indicting a good matter; for I speak of the things which I have made touching the King." Is he not a glorious King? Surely, "he is the chief among ten thousand; yea, he is altogether lovely!"

"Majestic sweetness sits enthroned
Upon the Saviour's brow;
His head with radiant glories crown'd,
His lips with grace o'erflow:
No mortal can with him compare,
Of all the sons of men;
Fairer is he than all the fair
That fill the heavenly train."

My dear brother, my heart grows warm, and my soul returns to life as I dwell upon this theme—

"Jesus, I love thy charming name,
'Tis music to my ear."

Upon this theme I will converse with you from early dawn till the sun goeth down. My soul is ravished with his charms.

"How sweet the name of Jesus sounds
In a believer's ear."

Yes, "one day" on this theme "is better than a thousand." "Here will I take up my rest."

Farewell, dear brother, for the present.

Affectionately yours,
CHRISTIANOS.

P. S. I need not tell the reader that the present number is all a digression. In our next we will resume our regular course.

CHURCH EDIFICATION.

This most desirable achievement, this divinely important object, is to be accomplished only by the due use of the divinely appointed means of teaching and ruling. For this blissful purpose, God has graciously and abundantly furnished his people with all necessary instructions, both with respect to the qualifications of the teachers, and also with respect to the matter and manner of their teaching, and the conscientious and dutiful submission due to their divine admonitions. See the following scriptures—Acts xi. 28—30. A great dearth throughout all the world—came to pass in the days of Cesar. Then the disciples (at Antioch) every man, according to his ability, determined to send relief to the brethren which dwelt in Judea; which also they did, and sent it to the *elders* by the hands of Barnabas and Saul. And xiv. 23. When they had ordained them *elders* in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed. And xv. 4—6. When they were come to Jerusalem, they were received of the church, and of the Apostles, and *elders*, and they declared all things that God had done with them. And xx. 17—21: 26—35. From Miletus Paul sent to Ephesus, and called the *elders* of the church. And when they were come to him, he said to them, Ye know, from the first day that I came into Asia, after what manner I have been with you at all seasons, serving the Lord with all humility of mind, and with many tears and temptations which befell me by the lying in wait of the Jews: and how I kept back nothing that was profitable, but have shewed you, and have taught you publicly, and from house to house; testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.—Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men: for I have not shunned to declare to you all the counsel of God. Take heed, therefore, to yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers (*bishops*) to feed the church of God which he has purchased with his own blood. For I know that after my departing shall grievous wolves enter in among you, not sparing the flock Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch, and remem-

ber, that by the space of three years, I ceased not to warn every one, night and day, with tears. 1 Tim. v. 17. Let the *elders* that *rule well* be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in word and doctrine (or teaching.) For the scripture saith, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn. And—The laborer is worthy of his reward. Gal. vi. 6. Let him that is taught in the word, communicate to him that teacheth, in all good things. Titus i. 5—9. For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain *elders* in every city, as I had appointed thee. If any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot, or unruly. For a *bishop* must be blameless as the steward of God; not self-willed, not soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre; but a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate; holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able, by sound doctrine (or *teaching*) both to exhort, and to convince the gainsayers. 1 Pet. v. 1—4. The *elders* which are among you, I exhort, who am also an *elder*, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock. Eph. vi. 21. But that you may also know my affairs, and how I do, Tychicus, a beloved brother and faithful *minister* in the Lord, will make known to you all things. Col. i. 7—8. As you also learned of Epaphras our dear fellow-servant, who is for you a faithful *minister* of Christ, who also declared to us your love in the Spirit.

Phil. i. 1. Paul and Timotheus the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the *bishops* and deacons. 1 Tim. iii. 1—7. This is a true saying, If a man desire the office of a *bishop*, he desireth a good work. A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach, not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous; one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; (for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he *take care* of the church of God?)—not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil. Moreover he must have a good report of them that are without, lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil.—For a bishop must be blameless as the steward of God. Luke xii. 42—43. Who then is that faithful and wise steward, whom his lord shall make *ruler* over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season? Blessed is that servant whom his Lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing:—he will make him ruler over all that he hath. Eph. iv. 8—11. When Christ ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts to men. And he gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some *pastors* and *teachers;* for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the *ministry*, for the edifying of the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. Isaiah lxii. 6. I have set *watchmen* upon thy walls, O Jerusalem,

which shall never hold their peace day nor night. Heb. xiii, 7—17. Remember them that have the *rule* over you, who have spoken to you the word of God; whose faith follow considering the end of their conversation: Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever. Obey them that have the *rule* over you, and submit yourselves: for they *watch* for your souls, as they that *must give account*, that they may do it with joy and not with grief—for that is unprofitable for you.

The official epithets, qualifications, and duties, explicitly mentioned in the above quotations, duly considered, amply show the abundant provisions divinely intended for the edification of the church.

The very first epithet, namely, that of *elder*, provides for experimental knowledge; which joined with the specified attributes of character required to qualify him for the office of bishop, or overseer, and the duties enjoined upon him as such, go to provide, as far as possible, for his moral and religious influence and utility; as does also the title of *minister*, or voluntary servant (not doulos but diakonos) see 1 Tim. iv. 6. If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good *minister* (diakonos) of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith, and of good doctrine whereunto thou hast attained. 1 Peter v. 1—4. The elders—I exhort—Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight not by constraint, but willingly: not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind: neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock: and when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory, that fadeth not away. But it would appear superfluous to expatiate upon the well known import, and comprehensive responsibility included in the other official epithets of bishop, steward, pastor, teacher, watchman, divinely chosen to express the duties of the gospel ministry. Suffice it to say, that whatever can be done, by teaching the word, and executing the law of Christ, is clearly and fully expressed by the well known import of those official titles; as are also the correspondent duties incumbent upon those to whom they minister. For the truth of which we refer again to the above quotations. T. C.

SELF-EDUCATION.

Carrollton, Carroll county, Ohio, Oct. 24, 1839.

Beloved Brother:

Is not the following essay on "Self-Education, worthy of extensive circulation? Are not the remarks true and worthy of regard? Yea, verily.

"Education, in the broadest and most comprehensive sense of the term, is the just and harmonious development of all the faculties and powers, by which each is prepared to fulfil its appropriate purpose, and all are made to advance the highest improvement of the individual. In fewer words, man's whole nature is the subject upon which education should be made to operate, and the perfection of his whole nature is its end. But as man's whole nature is made up of various parts, each

requiring a culture, in some respects, peculiar to itself; it is expedient, and indeed, necessary, in considering the subject, to divide and subdivide it, and to examine it under distinct points of view.

Thus, education considered in reference to the grand divisions of man's intellectual and moral nature, is of two kinds:—that which teaches him *to know*, and that which induces him *to be;* that which *instructs* him, and that which *improves* him; that which makes him a wiser being; that which fills his *mind* with light, and that which fills his *heart* with love; that which opens to him a fuller communion with the *intelligence* of the Deity, and that which brings him into an ever-increasing conformity *to his moral perfections.*

Education farther viewed in reference to the modes in which it is conducted, is of three kinds:

First, there is that which consists of direct instruction, and is communicated by parents, teachers, and in seminaries prepared for this purpose.

Secondly, there is that instruction, which is indirect, and consists of the insensible influence of events, and of the condition in which, in providence, we are placed. It is that, for example, which a child sees, when we perceive him not; what he thinks of us, and of our conduct, when we do not think of him; his silent inferences from our modes of life, habits, opinions, likings, and prejudices, the unsuspected influences of our associates, and of his own; in a word, all the influence of all the circumstances wherein he is placed, which, though quick and unsuspected in their operation, are very palpable and decisive in their effects.

And thirdly, there is that education which the individual accomplishes in and for himself; that self-education which is the result of voluntary effort and self-discipline.

Of these three modes of education, the first, namely, direct instruction, has great influence in the formation of character; the second, or the silent education of events and circumstances, exerts a more decisive influence; and the third, self-education, is, on all accounts, the most essential.

It is on this, that we propose to offer some remarks. We shall first attempt to establish and illustrate the position, that knowledge and virtue, or in other words, intellectual and moral improvement, are mainly the mind's own work; and we shall next advert to some practical uses of this truth.

In the first place, it is a plain fact, that without this self-labor, self-discipline, self-education, all direct instruction must be unavailing and useless. And is not this obvious? For what is the nature and extent of all the ordinary processes of direct instruction? They are, at best, but means, facilities, and aids, which pre-suppose in the mind to which they are applied an active, self-moving co-operation. Without this they can effect nothing. They are efficacious just so far as the individual *by his own energies seconds their application, and no farther.* They cannot advance him a single step, unless he makes corresponding efforts to go. As means, facilities, and aids, they are of immense importance. They may put us in a condition for improvement; they may afford us the light of experience to direct our efforts; they may remove unnecessary obstacles from our path; they may point out de-

fects and show us the method of correcting them; they may enable us to strengthen what is weak, and to use well what is strong; they may instruct us in the best employment of our faculties; they may teach us how to study, when to study, what to study, and wherefore to study. But after all, study we must, and study is self-work, and incomparably the hardest work that is accomplished beneath the sun. For study, be it remembered, is not dreaming awake, though we sit through the live-long day, in the student's posture, with our eyes fixed upon a book. It is not much preparation and bustle about the means of knowledge. But it is, and it is nothing less than—the intense concentration of all our intellectual powers upon a given train of thought, to the temporary annihilation of all things else, to the forgetfulness even of our own existence. It is the grappling of the entire mind with a subject, as if for life, until it yields the blessing we seek. It is an effort, compared with which, the hardest toil of the day-laborer is play and pastime. And this, we need not say, is *self-work*. None can do it for another. None can carry us up the hill of learning. It must be done, if done, by the strain upon our own sinews; by the wrenching of our own muscles; by the blood and toil from our own feet; by the indomitable resolution of our own wills. Without this effort on our own parts, all the means of instruction which this, and all other ages have devised, are vain, worse than vain; they are wasted, thrown away, and might as well be heaped upon a dead man or a statue.

All this, thus stated, is very plain, and will be readily admitted. And yet there is nothing, in point of fact, more frequently forgotten.

There is a vague notion, as has been justly remarked, widely prevalent, that schools and ampler seminaries are able, by a power inherent in themselves, to fill the mind with learning, or that it is to be received inertly, like the influences of the atmosphere, by a mere residence at the place of instruction. But this is a sad mistake. Something in this way, doubtless may be effected. Something may be thus insensibly imbibed. A young man cannot pass his time, for years, in scenes like these, without catching something from the inspiration of the place. Intercourse, conversation, and sympathy with his companions, will, without much voluntary effort on his part, convey some information, and mould, in some degree, the habits of his mind. But this, admitting it in its full extent, amounts to but very little. It is, moreover, too vague to be of any practical value. The truth, after all, is, that the most elaborate and manifold apparatus of instruction can impart nothing of importance to the passive and inert mind. It is almost as unavailing as the warmth and light of the sun, and all the sweet influences of the heavens, shed upon desert sands.

If all the means of education which are so profusely scattered over the world: and if all the philosophers and teachers of ancient and modern times were to be collected together, and made to bring their combined efforts to bear upon an individual—all they could do would be to afford the opportunity of improvement: they could not give him a single valuable thought independently of his own exertion. All that could be accomplished, must still be done within the little compass of his own mind; and they could not approach this, by a hair's breadth nearer, than access was made for them by his own co-operation. Nothing short of a miracle can teach a man any thing independently of

this. All that he learns is effected by self-discipline, and self-discipline is the mind's own work. We all are under God, intellectually, the makers of ourselves."

Yours in him who is always willing to help those who help themselves, CHAS. D. HURLBOTT.

REMARKS UPON THE ABOVE.

If all that is above asserted respecting the indirect or involuntary influence of circumstances, and the indispensable necessity of self-discipline, or self-education, be evidently true (and who that duly considers the subject can rationally doubt it,) then what must be the real condition of the Christian world, morally and religiously considered!!! Surely it must be truly deplorable. For where shall we find the due and requisite attention paid to the Bible?—Where shall we find the family thus practising, and so realizing the divine injunctions, as prescribed in the following scriptures:—Deut. xi. 18—21: 1 Cor. x. 31: and 1 Tim. iv. 7—8.—"Ye shall lay up these my words in your heart, and in your soul, and bind them for a sign upon your hand, and they shall be as frontlets between your eyes. And you shall teach them your children, speaking of them when thou sittest in thy house, and when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. That your days may be multiplied, and the days of your children—as the days of heaven upon the earth. Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatever ye do, do all to the glory of God. For—Godliness is profitable to all things, having the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come." And what is godliness but a real, intentional, practical conformity to the divine will? For "this is the love of God, that we keep his commandments:" and holiness is the order of love, without which none shall see, that is enjoy, the Lord.

If then "it is a plain fact," that without the self-labor, self-discipline, and self-education, above described, "all direct instruction must be unavailing and useless."—And "if study is nothing less than the entire concentration of all our intellectual powers upon a given train of thought, to the temporary annihilation of all things else,—to the forgetfulness even of our own existence,—the grappling of the entire mind with a subject, as if for life, till it yields the blessing we seek." Then, indeed, how few are there, that attain to the enjoyment of the blessings divinely intended by the due and diligent perusal and study of the Holy Scriptures. For how few are there that can truly say with the Psalmist, "O how love I thy law! it is my study all the day!" Nevertheless it will still hold good—that *truly*, and *only* blessed is the man, "whose delight is in the law of the Lord; and who doth meditate in his law day and night. He shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season: and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper." T. C.

NEWS FROM THE CHURCHES.

Jamestown, Ohio, September 15, 1839.

Our streets have been crowded with vehicles of conveyance of all sorts for two or three days. The Mad River Baptist Association is in session two miles from the village, and the Episcopal Methodists have a camp-meeting within a mile or two from town. One would be led to suppose that all the people are worshippers, seeing the rush and seeming eagerness manifested by them to get to the places of meeting

We have had preaching in the village every night, by some one of the preachers who are attending the Association; and I have had some of their Elders and Deacons around my fireside, and have conversed freely with them, and I am happy to say that much of that discord which has heretofore prevailed among us is giving way. The spirit of compromise in matters of opinion seems to be diffusing itself. We had an excellent discourse by Elder Moore last evening, from Ephesians, particularly these words,—"Be not drunk with wine, but be filled with the Spirit." The speaker was happy in his illustrations of the indwelling of the Spirit, and he did not force the Spirit to dwell in a foul house, (as the manner of some is,) but clearly showed that the house (human heart) must first be cleansed from all pollutions, or rather pollutors. This he illustrated by the cleansing of the Temple, and the driving out of the dove-sellers and money-changers; and he was very happy in his illustration of the manner of grieving the Spirit and forcing it to desert the heart. This he illustrated by a house of entertainment that took in a traveller, and afterwards admitted drunkards, swearers, gamblers, thieves, robbers, &c. to the grief and annoyance of the traveller, so that he left the inn, and sought a more quiet and peaceable habitation.

He also drew a clear line of distinction between those miraculous powers and gifts of the Spirit which were bestowed on the few, and that indwelling of the Spirit which was bestowed on all the children of God. Elder Moore, as a teacher, is not excelled by many. He is an excellent man.

The strictures of the Rev. R. W. Landis on the new version of the New Testament is being republished in all the oppostion papers. The Western Recorder, at Zanesville, has copied them from the Biblical Recorder. I requested the Editor to publish the Preface to the third edition; but do not know whether he will comply or not.

Brother John Taffe is expected here this week to hold a meeting. M. WINANS.

Boon County, Missouri, September 30, 1839.

I do not remember the date of my last letter to you, but I think it was just after my return from Fayette, on the first Lord's day of this month, where there were five additions. On the second Lord's day Brother Joseph Coons and myself were in the city of Jefferson, where four were added to the Lord. The following Friday old brother B. W. Stone reached my house from Illinois The next day we commenced operations in Columbia: on Sunday there were 5 additions. On Monday we began at Friendship—a *new* congregation about 10 miles north of Columbia. The meeting was continued there and in its vicinity four days, during which time there were 24 additions. On Saturday we began a three days' meeting at Bear Creek, brother Stone and other teaching brethren with us. Fifteen additions during the meeting. The next day brother Wills was at Friendship again, where 5 others confessed and obeyed the Saviour, which makes 49 additions in about ten days, in the same vicinity, *almost*. Brothers Stone and Lee left on Wednesday for Rocheport and Fayette, and I trust their labors will be blessed of God. Several from the Baptist ranks have recently united with us. I pray that brotherly love and Christian affection may increase among all saints. THOMAS M ALLEN.

[Much interesting news, omitted for want of room, shall appear in our next]

☞ Thoughts on Evidence, No. II. shall appear in our next number.

ERRATA.

Page 118, line tenth from bottom, for 'logical parable,' read *logical puzzle*. Same page, line sixth from bottom, for 'abased,' read *absurd*. Page 129, line twenty fifth from bottom, for 'this is hope,' read *this is my hope* Page 130, line 29d from bottom, for 'desires,' read *diseases*. Page 169, line 12th from top, for 'shed,' read *show*. Same page, line 17 from bottom, for 'lawyer,' read *critic*. Page 171, line 7th from top, for 'is,' read *was*. Page 292, 3d line from bottom, for 'their conjecture,' read *this conjecture*. Page 270 18th line from top, for 'assigned,' read *designed*. Page 445, 7th line from top, for 'of agency,' read *of its agency*. Page 445 20th line from top, for 'if liberty of action,' read *if no liberty of action*.' Page 533, 10th line from bottom, for 'unaware,' read *not unaware*. Page 533, 8th line from bottom, for 'the attempt, read *they attempt*. Page 533, 19th line from bottom, for 'Sarah,' read *Sarai*. Page 179, line 31st from bottom, for 'this,' read *his*. Page 180, line 23d from top, for period after 'illness,' read period after 'distress.' Letters to B, a sceptic, Nos. 6 and 7 misplaced—the last *first*, and the first *last;* pages 358 and 390. Also, the dates of the Editor's letters to his sister, pages 181 and 183, were omitted. The first was written in Nov. from Erwinton, S. C; the second from New Orleans, Louisiana.

INDEX.

A—All Elders Bishops, 381
American Biblical Repository Notice, 335
Applicants—The rights of Preachers and Churches to refuse. 323
B—Bacon College, 480
Mode of endowing, 380
Baptism of Fire, 381, 385
the Holy Spirit, 381
Bengal, singular movements in, 477
Bible-reading, 37, 289, 342, 392
Bunyan John, and the Bishop, 528
C—Christ Jesus, a perfect man in, 18
Christians, Morality of, 16, 227, 275, 316, 339, 403
Union of, 19, 60, 130, 134, 155, 211, 338, 344
Among the Sects, by Christianos, 43, 168, 213, 292, 295, 475, 529
by T. M. Henley, 124, 173, 176, 399
by M. Winans, 547
Christian Institution, the direct and immediate intention of, 41, 92, 216
Christian System, 336, 458
Christian Index at issue with us on a fact concerning regeneration, 371
Christian Ministry, 457
Christian Baptist, a new edition of, 383
Christian Palladium, 382
Christianity, an original Institution, 318
Church News, 45, 93, 192, 236, 283, 332, 377, 427, 468, 551, 597
Church Book, plan of, 30
Church Edification, 462
Character of Scepticism, 330
Circular Letter to the Churches in New York, 346
Commencement of the Kingdom, 453
Remarks on, 455
Correspondents, 288
Consistency of Inconsistency, 118
Conversions from Catholicism, 96
Converts, Hints to Young, 68, 289
D—Debt, being in, 558
Defence of L. C. Todd, 117
Department, a new, in the Harbinger, 451
Disciples of Christ—Sketches of Religious History, 164
Discipline, 329
Discussion of Universalism.—Mr. Skinner to Mr. Campbell, 75, 360
Mr. Campbell to Mr. Skinner, 82, 367
Divine Order of evangelizing the World, 25
E—Education, 87, 190, 233, 278
Evangelizing the World, the divine order for, 35
Evidence, thoughts on, 531
Evils of Sectarianism, 67
Extra, No. XI.—Review of Mr. Landis' Review of something called Campbellism. 481
F—False Tests of Truth and Error, 12
Fisher, the Revivalist, 280
Fisher & Waller, Messrs. 412
Forrester & Campbell, Booksellers, No. 117, Wood street, Pittsburg, Pa. 48, 336
G—Gardner Sarah H C, communication from, 419
General cause of Irreligion, 455
Grew Henry, letter from, 409
Reply to, 412
Grew Henry and Badger, &c. 227
God is our Father, 367
Gospel, the, 97, 145, 222, 314, 433, 577
H—Happiness—a fragment, 166
Hendricks J. T., notice of a pamphlet written by, 543
Hints to Young Converts, 68, 289
Horrors of War, 46
I J—Immersion, two witnesses for, 547
Impostors, 382
Incidents on a Tour to the South, 6, 54, 110, 186, 193, 261, 308
Institution, a new, 446
Institution, Christian, the direct and immediate intention of, 41, 92, 216

Items, 431
Jews, state and prospects of, 295
Justice and Equity, 332
K.—Kingdom, commencement of, 453
remarks on, 455
L.—Landis Rev. R. W. of Jeffersonville, Pa. reply to, 481
Letter from Sarah H. C. Gardner, 419
Edward B. Howells, 384
Henry Grew, 409
to Mrs. Phebe Clapp, 179
to Mrs. Alicia Clapp, from A. Campbell, 181, 183
from Gustavus Adolphus and others, 31
reply to, 32
Lynd Mr., Note from, 381
and Spiritual Influence, 225
M.—Man without Religion, 455
Meetings at Dutch Fork, West Liberty, Wellsburg, and Bethany, 552
Meredith Mr. and the Biblical Recorder, 546
Mexico, good news from, 235
Milton Spencer K., notice of, 47
Ministry, the Christian, 457
Mind without Religion, 357
Mississippi, to the brethren in, 479
Mormon Bible, 365
Morality of Christians, 16, 227, 275, 316, 339, 403
Music Book, 240
N.—Name, our, 337, 401, 478, 534, 541, 553
News from the churches, 45, 93, 192, 236, 283, 333, 377, 426, 468, 551, 597
Newspaper Veracity, 416
O.—Obituaries, 288, 384, 431, 552
Old School Theology, 39
Remarks on, 40
Ordination, 396, 566
Owen Debate, 480
P.—Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance, 575
Paidobaptist General Law repealed, 543
Parable against the Sadducees, 49
Periodicals, too many, 548
Power of Silence, 101
Poetry—What a Sermon should be, 432
Prayer, sermons on, 204, 272, 336
Preacher, an irresponsible, 479
Preface, 3
Prospectus of the Christian Banner, 48
Literary and Miscellaneous Gazette, 240
Universal Philanthropist and Beacon of Truth, 432
The Disciple, 550
Proofs of Benevolence in Creation, 349
Proposition, a new, 383
Q.—Queries and Answers, 287, 431
R.—Regeneration, 331
Religion of Excitement and the Excitement of Religion, 34
Enemies of, 34
Relics, 350
Religious Education in Schools, 351
Review of a Review of something called Campbellism, 481
Romantic in Religion and Morality, 294
Retort. 557
S.—Sadducees, the parable against, 49
Scepticism—Letters to a Sceptic, 128, 153, 221, 303, 358, 390, 436
Scepticism, character of, 330
Schools and Education, 233, 278
Sects, Christians among the, by Christianos, 43, 168, 213, 292, 395, 475, 529, 588
by Thomas M. Henley, 124, 168, 178, 209
Sects, by M. Winans 547
Sectarianism, evils of, 60
Secrest John, 479
Short Sermons on Christian Practice, 204, 272, 336, 342, 392
Silence, the power of, 101
Sin—a Dialogue, 107, 149, 268, 405, 443, 583
Signs of the Times, 320
Sketches of Religious History.—Disciples of Christ, 164

Skinner Mr..Notice, 288
Smith brother Carey, visit to Mississippi, 479
South, incidents on a tour to the, 6, 54, 110, 186, 193, 261, 308
Spiritual Agency, 332
Statistics of Indiana, 353
Stiles Rev. J. C.--again, 207
Supernatural Facts, an Address, 241
T—Thoughts on Evidence, 531
Thomas Dr. John. Note, 47
The Reconciliation, 72
Todd L. C., Defence of, 117
Tour to the South, 6, 54, 110, 186, 193, 261, 308
U—Universalism, Discussion of Mr. Skinner to Mr. Campbell, 75, 360
Mr. Campbell to Mr. Skinner, 82, 367
Union Christian, 19, 60, 130, 134, 155, 211, 338, 344
W—Worshipping Assemblies, 489
Y—Yearly Meetings in Trumbull and Cuyahoga counties, Ohio, 466
Yourself, 321

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC
REFERENCE DEPARTM.

This book is under no circumsta:
taken from the Building

BOARD